

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**JENEANE D MATTIX**  
Claimant

**APPEAL 17A-UI-07830-JCT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CONIFER REVENUE CYCLE SOLUTIONS**  
Employer

**OC: 06/11/17  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal  
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed an appeal from the June 28, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 18, 2017. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Stephanie Baharian, patient access manager. Employer Exhibit A and Department Exhibit D-1 were admitted into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUES:**

Is the appeal timely?

Did the claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to the employer?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a patient access representative and was separated from employment on June 13, 2017, when she quit without notice. Continuing work was available.

The claimant quit the employment citing stressful work conditions and unrelated bronchitis that had been affecting her for two weeks. The claimant did not provide medical documentation to the employer or for the hearing, and no treating physician advised her to quit the employment. The claimant stated that between March and June, the employer had experienced significant turnover of staff, causing existing staff to help cover as new employees were hired and trained. The claimant did not make the employer aware she was contemplating quitting due to work conditions. The claimant had access to EAP (Employers' Assistance Program) and was on approved intermittent FMLA for a personal medical condition.

An initial unemployment insurance decision resulting in disqualification of benefits was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on June 28, 2017. She received the decision within the appeal period. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or

received by the Appeals Bureau by July 8, 2017. The claimant first attempted to file the appeal online approximately two days after receipt, and she believed before July 4, 2017. When the claimant did not receive any follow up contact from IWD, she learned she would need to resubmit the appeal online, which she did on August 3, 2017 (Department Exhibit D-1.)

### **REASONINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsections 10 and 11, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. *Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Bd. of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The Iowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from unemployment insurance 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa

1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. *Hendren v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The claimant made a good faith effort to file an appeal in a timely manner but it was not received. Immediately upon receipt of information to that effect, a second appeal was filed. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's separation from the employment was without good cause attributable to the employer.

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 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 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:

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

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. See 871 IAC 24.25. "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. Industrial Relations Commission*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. App. 1973). Quits due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions are deemed to be for good cause attributable to the employer. See 871 IAC 24.26(4). The test is whether a reasonable person would have quit under the circumstances. See *Aalbers v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 431 N.W.2d 330 (Iowa 1988) and *O'Brien v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (1993).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the

following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.* After assessing the credibility of the claimant who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge finds the weight of the evidence in the record fails to establish the claimant has met his burden of proof to establish he quit for good cause reasons within Iowa law.

A claimant with work issues or grievances must make some effort to provide notice to the employer to give the employer an opportunity to work out whatever issues led to the dissatisfaction. Failure to do so precludes the employer from an opportunity to make adjustments which would alleviate the need to quit. *Denvy v. Board of Review*, 567 Pacific 2d 626 (Utah 1977). The administrative law judge recognizes the stress that staff shortages can have on current employees, but also recognizes the employer was trying to resolve the matter, and the claimant had resources available to address stress or health complications as needed. Further, the claimant made no efforts to preserve her employment or to give the employer an opportunity to address her concerns before severing employment. Therefore, based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant may have had compelling personal reasons to quit the employment but has failed to establish she quit with good cause attributable to the employer, according to Iowa law. Benefits are denied.

**DECISION:**

The June 28, 2017, (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant filed a timely appeal. Claimant voluntarily left the employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

---

Jennifer L. Beckman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/rvs