BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

JOAN A EMMANUEL	
Claimant	: HEARING NUMBER: 20B-UI-08940
and	EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD DECISION
1ST CLASS STAFFING LLC	
Employer	

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-1

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The issue of timeliness was raised when the Claimant filed an appeal that was faxed October 1, 2020, one day beyond the statutory deadline of September 30, 2020. The reason for the delay was because the Claimant never received the Notice of Decision. For this reason, we find good cause has been established for the late appeal, and the board shall consider it to be timely.

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. Two members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. With the following modification, the administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED** with the following **MODIFICATION**:

The Employment Appeal Board would modify the administrative law judge's Reasoning and Conclusions of Law by making the following modifications:

In the Reasoning and Conclusions of Law section of the decision, the Board would strike the citation to Iowa Code section 96.5(1)"d", as it is not applicable since the Claimant had a work-related injury. Instead, the Board would add that the Claimant did not quit over her injury. Rather, the record supports she quit because she no longer desired to perform work in the production area. And even if we to determine she quit over her injury, the Claimant failed to provide notice to the Employer in accordance with the following:

871 IAC 24.26(6)"b" provides:

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.

Lastly, the Claimant submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by the Claimant was not presented at hearing. Accordingly all the new and additional information submitted has not been relied upon in making our decision, and has received no weight whatsoever, but rather has been wholly disregarded.

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman