IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ROSE LAGRANGE Claimant

APPEAL NO: 13A-UI-00088-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA Employer

> OC: 12/02/12 Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The University of Iowa (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated December 27, 2012, reference 01, which held that Rose LaGrange (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on February 5, 2013. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Mary Eggenberg, Benefits Specialist and Theresa Meislein, Human Resources Representative for the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant's voluntary separation of employment qualifies her to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

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 employed as a full-time clerk from June 13, 2011 through October 11, 2012. As of January 18, 2012, she was unable to work in her full-time position due to a non-work-related medical leave of absence. The claimant had returned to work on a limited part-time basis but the doctor restricted her from working full time until December 31, 2012.

The claimant applied for and received long-term disability benefits. She was approved for leave under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and her 12-week leave was exhausted on October 4, 2012. The claimant was scheduled to return to work on October 5, 2012. The employer has no record of her calling anyone and she said she called but could not reach anyone.

The claimant dated a resignation letter on October 10, 2012 and mailed it to the employer. The employer prepared a termination letter for the claimant on October 11, 2012 after she failed to return from a leave of absence. The employer received the resignation letter on October 15, 2012.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective December 2, 2012 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the reasons for the claimant's separation from employment qualify her to receive unemployment insurance benefits. All terminations of employment are generally classified as layoffs, quits, discharges or other separations. 871 IAC 24.1(113)(a). A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if she voluntarily quits employment without good cause attributable to the employer or an employer has discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code Sections 96.5-1 and 96.5-2-a.

The evidence establishes the claimant was unable to work due to a non-work-related medical condition and was placed on a medical leave of absence. A leave of absence negotiated with the consent of both parties, employer and employee, is deemed a period of voluntary unemployment for the employee-individual, and the individual is considered ineligible for benefits for the period. 871 IAC 24.22(2)(j). If at the end of a period of negotiated leave of absence the employer fails to reemploy the employee-individual, the individual is considered laid off and eligible for benefits. 871 IAC 24.22(2)(j)(1). On the other hand, if the employee-individual fails to return at the end of the leave of absence and subsequently becomes unemployed the individual is considered as having voluntarily quit and therefore is ineligible for benefits. 871 IAC 24.22(j)(2).

The evidence in the record establishes that the claimant did, in fact, fail to return to the employment at the end of the leave of absence. Accordingly, the separation from the employment is deemed a voluntary quit and claimant is disqualified for benefits.

lowa Code § 96.3(7) provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See lowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated December 27, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

Susan D. Ackerman Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/tll