

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**TERESA RUIZ**  
Claimant

**COPART OF CONNECTICUT INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 20A-UI-07422-AW-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**  
**DECISION**

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

---

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting  
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Filing – Timely Appeal  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35 – Filing

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from the June 2, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 7, 2020, at 10:00 a.m. Claimant participated. Employer did not participate. No exhibits were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

**ISSUES:**

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct or a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer.  
Whether claimant filed a timely appeal.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The Unemployment Insurance Decision was mailed to claimant at the correct address on June 2, 2020. Claimant did not receive the decision. Claimant contacted Iowa Workforce Development when she stopped receiving unemployment benefits and learned of the decision. The decision states that it becomes final unless an appeal is postmarked or received by Iowa Workforce Development Appeals Section by June 12, 2020. Claimant appealed the decision via email on July 1, 2020. The appeal was received by Iowa Workforce Development on July 1, 2020.

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time Title Clerk from February 13, 2017 until her employment with Copart of Connecticut ended on February 28, 2020. On February 28, 2020, employer suspended claimant for two weeks; this was a disciplinary suspension related to claimant's attendance. Claimant was told to await a telephone call from employer about when to return to work. Claimant never received a phone call from employer to return to work. Claimant received an email from employer that claimant's department was permanently shut down and that claimant could come to the office to retrieve her personal belongings. Claimant filed her initial claim for benefits effective March 22, 2020.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that claimant's appeal was timely.

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part: "[u]nless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision."

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

1. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

(a) If transmitted via the United States Postal Service on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.

(b) If transmitted via the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.

(c) If transmitted by any means other than [United States Postal Service or the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES)], on the date it is received by the division.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

2. The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

The Iowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott* 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982).

Claimant did not receive the decision in the mail. Upon learning of the decision, claimant filed her appeal. Claimant's delay in submitting her appeal was due to error or delay of the United States Postal Service. The appeal is considered timely.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did not voluntarily quit her employment; claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Iowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1). 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). Where there is no expressed intention or act to sever the employment relationship, the case must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). In this case, claimant had no intention of terminating her employment relationship with Copart of Connecticut. Because claimant did not voluntarily quit her job, claimant's separation from employment must be analyzed as a discharge.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) provides:

An individual shall be *disqualified for benefits*:

2. *Discharge for misconduct*. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The disqualification shall continue until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)(a) provides:

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

Claimant was discharged because employer permanently closed claimant's department. There is no evidence of misconduct after claimant completed her suspension for attendance. Employer has not met its burden of proving disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

**DECISION:**

Claimant's appeal was timely. The June 2, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.



---

Adrienne C. Williamson  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
Iowa Workforce Development  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax (515)478-3528

August 14, 2020  
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/sam