

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**JACK PETSCHÉ**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-05783-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CRICSUPP INC**  
Employer

**OC: 04/20/14**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit  
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

CRICSUPP (employer) appealed a representative's May 27, 2014, decision (reference 01) that concluded Jack Petsche (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for June 26, 2014. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated by Troy Huisenga, Owner/Operator, and Todd Witt, Assistant Manager/Sales Associate.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**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 hired in 2012, as a full-time sales associate. The employer does not have a handbook. On March 22, 2014, the claimant was working in the employer's GNC store in a strip center. He left work for the day and did not lock the doors. A customer appeared and walked into the store. The customer notified the employer of the problem. It was three hours before an employee could secure the store. The employer suspended the claimant from March 23 through April 3, 2014.

The claimant was scheduled to return to work on April 4, 2014. The claimant did not appear for work or notify the employer of his absence on April 4, 17, 24, 26, 2014. The claimant worked on April 15, 2014, and left the store unattended for 15 minutes. April 15, 2014, was the last day the claimant worked and performed services. The employer considered the claimant to voluntarily quit when he failed to appear for work after April 15, 2014.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of April 20, 2014. He received \$2,240.00 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer participated personally at the fact-finding interview on May 23, 2014, by Jon Murphy.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1) 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.

The claimant was suspended and returned to work prior to his filing for unemployment insurance benefits. The separation that is at issue is the one that occurred after he was to return to work on April 4, 2014. 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). The claimant's intention to voluntarily leave work was evidenced by the claimant's actions. The claimant stopped appearing for work after April 15, 2014. There was no evidence presented at the hearing of good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are denied.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code section 96.3-7-a, -b.

871 IAC 24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

- (1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and

information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid \$2,240.00 in unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative's May 27, 2014, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid \$2,240.00 in unemployment insurance benefits.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css