IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

CARL J WENTWORTH

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-17514-AD-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TSI ENTERPRISES INC

Employer

OC: 04/18/21

Claimant: Respondent (2)

lowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

lowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

lowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On August 9, 2021, TSI Enterprises Inc (employer/appellant) filed an appeal from the July 29, 2021 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on a finding claimant was discharged on September 9, 2020 without a showing of misconduct.

A telephone hearing was held on September 30, 2021. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. Employer participated by Risk Manager Sarah Fiedler. Carl Wentworth (claimant/respondent) did not register a number for the hearing or participate.

Employer's Exhibits A-F were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUE(S):

- I. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?
- II. Was the claimant overpaid benefits? Should claimant repay benefits or should employer be charged due to employer participation in fact finding?
- III. Is the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

Claimant's first day of employment was August 20, 2014. The last day claimant worked on the job was May 24, 2020. Claimant was on leave for a personal medical issue from that date and continuing until September 9, 2020. Claimant fell out of communication with employer around that time and did not return to work. Employer has not heard from him since that time. The

unemployment insurance system shows claimant has not received benefits in the claim year beginning April 18, 2021.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons set forth below, the July 29, 2021 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on a finding claimant was discharged on September 9, 2020 without a showing of misconduct is REVERSED.

I. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?

lowa 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. 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.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25 provides in relevant part:

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.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26 provides in relevant part:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

- **(6)** Separation because of illness, injury, or pregnancy.
- a. Nonemployment related separation. The claimant left because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician. Upon recovery, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the claimant returned and offered to perform services to the employer, but no suitable, comparable work was available. Recovery is defined as the ability of the claimant to perform all of the duties of the previous employment.

Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. lowa Code § 96.6(2). The employer has the burden of proving that a claimant's departure from employment was voluntary. *Irving v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 883 N.W.2d 179 (lowa 2016). "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". Id. (citing *Cook v. Iowa Dept. of Job Service*, 299 N.W.2d 698, 701 (lowa 1980)).

"Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not to the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Industrial Relations Commission*, 277 S.2d 827 (Florida App. 1973). While a notice of intent to quit is not required to obtain unemployment benefits where the claimant quits due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions, the case for good cause is stronger where the employee complains, asks for correction or accommodation, and employer fails to respond. *Hy-Vee Inc. v. EAB*, 710 N.W.2d 1 (lowa 2005).

lowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer or who are discharged for work-connected misconduct. lowa Code §§ 96.5(1) and 96.5(2)a. A voluntary quitting of employment requires that an employee exercise a voluntary choice between remaining employed or terminating the employment relationship. Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd., 447 N.W.2d 137, 138 (lowa 1989); Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd., 492 N.W.2d 438, 440 (lowa Ct. App. 1992). 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 (lowa 1980).

Employer has carried its burden of proving claimant's departure from employment was voluntary. However, claimant has not carried his burden of proving the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to employer. Claimant left work for personal medical reasons on May 24, 2020 and did not return to employer upon recovery. Benefits are therefore denied from the effective date of the claim.

Because claimant has not received benefits in the current benefit year, the issue of whether claimant has been overpaid need not be addressed.

DECISION:

The July 29, 2021 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on a finding claimant was discharged on September 9, 2020 without a showing of misconduct is REVERSED. The separation from employment was disqualifying. The disqualification shall continue until claimant earns wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount.

Andrew B. Duffelmeyer

Administrative Law Judge

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

1000 East Grand Avenue

Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209

Fax (515) 478-3528

October 4, 2021

Decision Dated and Mailed

abd/mh

Note to Claimant:

If you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal with the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. If this decision denies benefits, you may be responsible for paying back benefits already received.

Individuals who are disqualified from or are otherwise ineligible for <u>regular</u> unemployment insurance benefits but who are unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information.