

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

ELVIRA B DOE
Claimant

EDENCREST LEGACY LLC
Employer

APPEAL NO. 20A-UI-07476-B2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 04/05/20
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits
871 IA Admin. Code 24(10) – Employer Participation in Fact Finding

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated June 26, 2020, reference 02, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on August 25, 2020. Claimant participated personally and with attorney Nadine Stille. Employer participated by Jill Clements.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer?

Whether claimant was overpaid benefits?

If claimant was overpaid benefits, should claimant repay benefits or should employer be charged due to employer's participation or lack thereof in fact finding?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on October 4, 2020. Claimant voluntarily quit on October 4, 2020 because employer called the police on multiple occasions after a coworker started trouble with claimant while claimant was visiting a relative.

Claimant worked as an RA for employer. Claimant also had a cousin working at the same facility and a former roommate working there. Claimant had previously removed the roommate when she refused to pay rent.

On or around October 3, 2019 claimant went over to a building different than the one she worked when she got off from work, as she was getting money from a cousin. While visiting her cousin, the former roommate came up and was starting trouble with claimant. Claimant did not want to have any altercation and walked away from the former roommate. The roommate then went to a supervisor and made up a story about threats that claimant gave to her. The supervisor called police. The police came to the place of business and claimant's cousin called

claimant to tell her police were looking for her. Claimant went back to the facility and was questioned by the police as to her threatening the former roommate. Claimant strongly stated that she did not threaten the former roommate in any way.

The next day, the former roommate again went to the supervisor and the police were contacted again. Claimant had had no contact with the roommate. The police once again came to talk with claimant, this time at her house.

Claimant stated that she was trying to show her children how to live a law abiding life with no encounters with the police. She chose to quit because she could not control the roommate and the supervisor repeatedly called the police on claimant without first investigating the story with claimant.

Claimant has received unemployment benefits in this matter in the amount of \$3,999.00 in state benefits and \$4,800.00.

Employer did substantially participate in fact finding in this matter by speaking with the fact finder when employer was called.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 Code section 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.

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has established that claimant voluntarily quit for good cause attributable to employer when claimant terminated the employment relationship because employer chose to contact the police on multiple occasions rather than conduct an internal investigation into the disagreement between claimant and a former roommate who had hostility toward claimant. The administrative law judge only received testimony from one person in this matter who was at the scene when the altercation occurred; the claimant. Claimant's testimony was that she had not raised her voice and had not threatened the former roommate, but the supervisor called police on claimant rather than investigating the scene. Twice. Claimant had good cause to quit her job when she felt untrusted and not believed and felt that police might be called based on any accusation. This feeling of harassment was attributable to employer's inaction in investigating the allegations. Benefits are allowed.

The overpayment issue is moot.

The issue of employer participation is moot.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated June 26, 2020, reference 02, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.



Blair A. Bennett
Administrative Law Judge

August 28, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/sam