

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

ANASTASIA R MORGAN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-07249-S1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WELLS FARGO BANK NA
Employer

OC: 06/05/16
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Wells Fargo Bank (employer) appealed a representative's June 23, 2016, decision (reference 01) that concluded Anastasia Morgan (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 20, 2016. The claimant participated personally. The employer was represented by Jaclyn Fischler, Hearings Representative, and participated by Damien Daley, Loan Administration Manager, and Judith Escobar, Claimant Service Representative. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on December 17, 2012, as a full-time loan servicing specialist four. The claimant was on short-term disability leave from March 7 to April 10, 2016. On or about April 22, 2016, the claimant was diagnosed with paradoxical vocal cord dysfunction or vocal fold motion disorder. Her speech therapist thought that the condition was work-related. The claimant was restricted to speaking one to two hours per day.

On April 22, 2016, the claimant spoke with the employer and asked for accommodations. The employer was unable to accommodate the claimant because she was a call center employee. The employer did not understand the claimant when she said her condition was work-related. Speaking was difficult for the claimant.

On June 3, 2016, the claimant submitted her resignation. The employer did not accommodate her medical condition and did not submit her claim for workers' compensation. The claimant was not receiving any income. Her resignation was effective June 7, 2016. After her resignation was submitted, the employer approved an additional disability leave through June 7, 2016.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of June 5, 2016. She received \$2,155.00 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer did not personally participate at the fact-finding interview on June 22, 2016. The employer provided documents in lieu of personal participation in the fact-finding interview. It did not provide the name of an employee with firsthand information that could not be contacted for rebuttal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily left the employment without good cause attributable to the employer.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(6)b 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:

(6) Separation because of illness, injury, or pregnancy.

b. Employment related separation. The claimant was compelled to leave employment because of an illness, injury, or allergy condition that was attributable to the employment. Factors and circumstances directly connected with the employment which caused or aggravated the illness, injury, allergy, or disease to the employee which made it impossible for the employee to continue in employment because of serious danger to the employee's health may be held to be an involuntary termination of employment and constitute good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant will be eligible for benefits if compelled to leave employment as a result of an injury suffered on the job.

In order to be eligible under this paragraph "b" an individual must present competent evidence showing adequate health reasons to justify termination; before quitting have informed the employer of the work-related health problem and inform the employer that the individual intends to quit unless the problem is corrected or the individual is reasonably accommodated. Reasonable accommodation includes other comparable work which is not injurious to the claimant's health and for which the claimant must remain available.

An individual who voluntarily leaves their employment due to an alleged work-related illness or injury must first give notice to the employer of the anticipated reasons for quitting in order to give the employer an opportunity to remedy the situation or offer an accommodation. *Suluki v. Employment Appeal Board*, 503 N.W.2d 402 (Iowa 1993). An employee who receives a reasonable expectation of assistance from the employer after complaining about working conditions must complain further if conditions persist in order to preserve eligibility for benefits. *Polley v. Gopher Bearing Company*, 478 N.W.2d 775 (Minn. App. 1991).

In this case the claimant did not inform the employer that she planned to quit if she was not accommodated. Inasmuch as the claimant did not give the employer proper notice prior to leaving employment, the separation was without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b.

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.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that she was not entitled to receive. The employer did not meaningfully participate in the fact-finding interview and is chargeable. The claimant's overpayment is waived.

DECISION:

The representative's June 23, 2016, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that she was not entitled to receive. The employer did not meaningfully participate in the fact-finding interview and is chargeable. The claimant's overpayment is waived.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs