

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**SONDRA J MOORE**  
Claimant

**APPEAL 20R-UI-07256-DB-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**GRAYSON ENTERPRISES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 03/22/20**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Overpayment of Benefits  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer Participation in Fact-finding Interview  
PL 116-136 Sec 2104(B) – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer/appellant filed an appeal from the April 21, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits to the claimant based upon her voluntarily quitting work. An appeal hearing was held on May 22, 2020. An administrative law judge issued a decision dated May 26, 2020. Claimant filed an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board. The Employment Appeal Board issued a decision on June 30, 2020 finding that the matter should be remanded to the Appeals Bureau for a new hearing, with notice provided to both parties. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 5, 2020. The claimant, Sondra J. Moore, participated personally. The employer, Grayson Enterprises Inc., participated through witness Jack Coulter. Employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant's administrative records, including the fact-finding documents.

**ISSUES:**

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer?  
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?  
Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?  
Has the claimant been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as front of the house manager at the employer's restaurant. Her most recent period of employment began on July 13, 2016 and ended on February 2, 2020 when she voluntarily quit. Jack and Debbie Coulter were the claimant's immediate supervisors.

Claimant tendered her verbal resignation to Mrs. Coulter in December of 2019. Claimant originally set her final day as January 2, 2020; however, Mrs. Coulter asked her to stay on until February of 2020. Claimant agreed and her last day worked on the job was February 2, 2020.

Claimant's job duties included hiring and training staff; managing the day to day operations of the restaurant; payroll; and filling in for staff when they were absent.

Mrs. Coulter began spending more time in the restaurant in the fall and winter of 2019 due to staffing issues. Claimant believed that Mrs. Coulter was verbally abusive with the staff, which caused the claimant to have to listen and speak with the staff about their complaints they were having with Mrs. Coulter. Mrs. Coulter would yell at the cooks and servers to get the food out to the customers so that it would not be cold. Claimant also had issues with staff not showing up, not completing job duties or being unable to fill vacant positions. The employer had advertisements placed for staff on a continuous basis. The employer had interns come for one-year periods of time to work in the restaurant.

Claimant told Mr. Coulter that she was resigning because her husband's job was going well and she was going to take some time off before she opened her own restaurant. Mr. Coulter and the claimant discussed multiple properties that she was looking at to open her own restaurant.

Claimant filed her original claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective March 22, 2020. Claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits of \$1,924.00 from March 22, 2020 through May 16, 2020. Claimant has also received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation benefits of \$2,400.00 from April 19, 2020 through May 16, 2020. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview by telephone through witness Jack Coulter.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes as follows:

Iowa Code §96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W. 2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

Claimant had an intention to quit and carried out that intention by tendering her verbal resignation. As such, claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). "Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Indus. Relations Comm'n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). Claimant contends that she voluntarily quit due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(4) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

- (4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

As such, if claimant establishes that she left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions, benefits would be allowed. Generally, notice of an intent to quit is required by *Cobb v. Employment Appeal Board*, 506 N.W.2d 445, 447-78 (Iowa 1993), *Suluki v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 503 N.W.2d 402, 405 (Iowa 1993), and *Swanson v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 554 N.W.2d 294, 296 (Iowa Ct. App. 1996). These cases require an employee to give an employer notice of intent to quit, thus giving the employer an opportunity to cure working conditions. Accordingly, in 1995, the Iowa Administrative Code was amended to include an intent-to-quit requirement. The requirement was only added, however, to rule 871-24.26(6)(b), the provision addressing work-related health problems. No intent-to-quit requirement was added to rule 871-24.26(4), the intolerable working conditions provision. Our supreme court concluded that, because the intent-to-quit requirement was added to 871-24.26(6)(b) but not 871-24.26(4), notice of intent to quit is not required for intolerable working conditions. *Hy-Vee, Inc. v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 710 N.W.2d 1 (Iowa 2005).

“Good cause attributable to the employer” does not require fault, negligence, wrongdoing or bad faith by the employer. *Dehmel v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 433 N.W.2d 700, 702 (Iowa 1988)(“[G]ood cause attributable to the employer can exist even though the employer is free from all negligence or wrongdoing in connection therewith”); *Shontz v. Iowa Employment Sec. Commission*, 248 N.W.2d 88, 91 (Iowa 1976)(benefits payable even though employer “free from fault”); *Raffety v. Iowa Employment Security Commission*, 76 N.W.2d 787, 788 (Iowa 1956)(“The good cause attributable to the employer need not be based upon a fault or wrong of such employer.”). Good cause may be attributable to “the employment itself” rather than the employer personally and still satisfy the requirements of the Act. *Raffety*, 76 N.W.2d at 788 (Iowa 1956). Therefore, claimant was not required to give the employer any notice with regard to the alleged intolerable or detrimental working conditions prior to her quitting. However, claimant must prove that her working conditions were intolerable or detrimental.

Given the facts of this case, the issues listed in the findings of fact that the claimant was having with Mrs. Coulter does not rise to the level where a reasonable person would feel compelled to quit. As such, she has failed to prove that under the same circumstances a reasonable person would feel compelled to resign. See *O'Brien v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (Iowa 1993). Rather, the circumstances in this case seem to align with the conclusion that claimant was dissatisfied with her work environment in general and that she was entering into self-employment by opening her own restaurant. These are not good cause reasons attributable to the employer for claimant to have quit.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(21) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code § 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for

a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(21) The claimant left because of dissatisfaction with the work environment.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(19) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(19) The claimant left to enter self-employment.

As such, the claimant's voluntary quitting was not for a good-cause reason attributable to the employer. Regular unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa must be denied. Because benefits are denied, the issues of overpayment and chargeability must be addressed.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a

continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant.

Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)“b” as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant’s separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for those benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant’s employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7).

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview by submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the regular unemployment insurance benefits she received in connection with this employer’s account, \$1,924.00 from March 22, 2020 through May 16, 2020, and this employer’s account shall not be charged for those benefits paid.

The next issue is whether the claimant was eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (“FPUC”) benefits and whether she was overpaid those benefits. The administrative law judge finds that she was not eligible for those benefits and is overpaid FPUC benefits.

PL116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents’ allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

(A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus

(B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as “Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation”).

....

(f) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment. -- In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...


Because claimant is disqualified from receiving regular unemployment insurance benefits, she is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. While Iowa law does not require a claimant to repay regular unemployment insurance benefits when the employer does not participate in the fact-finding interview, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act ("Cares Act") makes no such exception for the repayment of FPUC. Therefore, the determination of whether the claimant must repay FPUC does not hinge on the employer's participation in the fact-finding interview. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC benefits in the gross amount of \$2,400.00 from April 19, 2020 through May 16, 2020. Claimant must also repay the FPUC benefits she received.

**DECISION:**

The April 21, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily quit her employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Unemployment insurance benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and earned wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount after her February 2, 2020 separation date, and provided she is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits of \$1,924.00 between March 22, 2020 and May 16, 2020 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and its account may not be charged for those benefits paid. Those benefits may be recovered in accordance with Iowa law.

The claimant has been overpaid FPUC benefits of \$2,400.00 from April 19, 2020 through May 16, 2020 and she is required to repay the agency those benefits she received. Those benefits may be recovered in accordance with Iowa law.



---

Dawn Boucher  
Administrative Law Judge

August 13, 2020  
Decision Dated and Mailed

db/sam

**Note to Claimant**

- This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa under state law. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.
- If you do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa under state law, you may qualify for benefits under the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (“PUA”) section of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (“Cares Act”) that discusses eligibility for claimants who are unemployed due to the Coronavirus.
- **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.**  
For additional information on how to apply for PUA go to:  
<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>.
- If you are denied regular unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa and wish to apply for PUA, please visit:  
<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information> and scroll down to “Submit Proof Here.” You will fill out the questionnaire regarding the reason you are not working and upload a picture or copy of your fact-finding decision. Your claim will be reviewed for PUA eligibility. If you are eligible for PUA, you will also be eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) until the program expires. Back payments PUA benefits may automatically be used to repay any overpayment of state benefits. If this does not occur on your claim, you may repay any overpayment by visiting:  
<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-overpayment-and-recovery>.
- If you have applied and have been approved for PUA benefits, this decision will **not** negatively affect your entitlement to PUA benefits.