# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

LYNN W ANDERSON

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-01769-HT** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**GARY SCHIPPERS** 

Employer

OC: 12/23/12

Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Section 96.5(1) – Quit

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Gary Schippers, filed an appeal from a decision dated February 13, 2013, reference 03. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Lynn Anderson. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on March 13, 2013. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where he could be contacted and did not participate. The employer participated by Owner Gary Schippers.

#### ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant quit work with good cause attributable to the employer.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Lynn Anderson was employed by Gary Schippers from July 7 until December 17, 2012 as a full-time truck driver. On December 14, 2012, he was involved in an accident in Estherville, lowa, when he "blacked out" and ran the truck off the road. It caused substantial damage to the truck, power poles, stop signs, utility boxes and mail boxes.

Mr. Anderson was examined at a local hospital and the attending physician issued instructions under the lowa Department of Transportation regulations he was not to drive unless he was seizure free for six months and had to be certified by a doctor as able to return to work. This has not yet occurred.

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The claimant was unable, under the law, to continue working in his job as the operator of a commercial vehicle. The employer could not legally continue to employ him. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was not discharged but is separated from the employment without good cause attributable to the employer

Iowa Code section 96.5-1-d provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

- 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. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:
- d. The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

## 871 IAC 24.25(35) 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 lowa 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 lowa 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:

- (35) The claimant left because of illness or injury which was not caused or aggravated by the employment or pregnancy and failed to:
- (a) Obtain the advice of a licensed and practicing physician;
- (b) Obtain certification of release for work from a licensed and practicing physician;
- (c) Return to the employer and offer services upon recovery and certification for work by a licensed and practicing physician; or
- (d) Fully recover so that the claimant could perform all of the duties of the job.

The court in Gilmore v. Empl. Appeal Bd., 695 N.W.2d 44 (Iowa Ct. App. 2004) noted that:

"Insofar as the Employment Security Law is not designed to provide health and disability insurance, only those employees who experience illness-induced separations that can fairly be attributed to the employer are properly eligible for unemployment benefits." White v. Employment Appeal Bd., 487 N.W.2d 342, 345 (Iowa 1992) (citing Butts v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 328 N.W.2d 515, 517 (Iowa 1983)).

The statute provides an exception where:

The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence

immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and ... the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible. lowa Code § 96.5(1)(d).

Section 96.5(1)(d) specifically requires that the employee has recovered from the illness or injury, and this recovery has been certified by a physician. The exception in section 96.5(1)(d) only applies when an employee is fully recovered and the employer has not held open the employee's position. *White*, 487 N.W.2d at 346; *Hedges v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 368 N.W.2d 862, 867 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985); see also *Geiken v. Lutheran Home for the Aged Ass'n*, 468 N.W.2d 223, 226 (Iowa 1991) (noting the full recovery standard of section 96.5(1)(d)).

The record reflects that claimant's illness is not work related and he is unable to perform full work duties pursuant to Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulation 49 CFR 391.41 because he has been restricted due to seizures. Employer is not obligated to accommodate a non-work-related medical condition. Accordingly, although the separation was for good personal reasons, it was without good cause attributable to the employer and benefits must be denied.

#### **DECISION:**

The representative's decision of February 13, 2013, reference 03, is reversed. Lynn Anderson is disqualified and benefits are withheld until he has earned ten times his weekly benefit amount in insured work, provided he is otherwise eligible. The issue of whether the claimant must repay the unemployment benefits is remanded to UIS division for determination.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeyer Administrative Law Judge	
/ tariiii ilaa va Lati aaaga	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
bgh/tll	