

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TAMMY D BENAVIDEZ
Claimant

ABCM CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 22A-UI-03586-AW-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 12/19/21
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the January 25, 2022 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits finding claimant was discharged on December 7, 2021 for no disqualifying reason. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 21, 2022. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Sharon Conrad, Office Manager and Human Resources Coordinator. Claimant's Exhibit A was admitted. Employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct or a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer.

Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.

Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

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

Claimant was employed as a full-time Activity Coordinator Assistant from January 7, 2021 until her employment with ABCM ended on January 17, 2021. Claimant worked Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. until 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. and most Saturdays. Claimant's direct supervisor was Sara Strickler, Activity Coordinator.

On December 6, 2021, claimant submitted her written resignation effective December 17, 2021. (Exhibit 1) Claimant last performed work for employer on December 7, 2021. From December 8, 2021 through December 17, 2021, claimant was absent due to illness. During claimant's absence, Strickler asked claimant to reconsider quitting.

On December 15, 2021, Strickler asked claimant if she decided to stay or go. (Exhibit A, p. 10) Claimant responded that she would like to stay but she wanted a pay raise and did not want to stock products anymore. (Exhibit A, pp. 11 – 12) Strickler said she would speak to employer and asked claimant when she planned to return. (Exhibit A, pp. 13 – 14) Claimant responded possibly Tuesday depending on her illness. (Exhibit A, p. 14) On January 17, 2021, employer accepted claimant's resignation.

The administrative record reflects that claimant filed for and has received unemployment insurance benefits in the gross amount of \$2,682.00 for nine-week period between December 19, 2021 and February 19, 2022. Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, because no interview was held.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes:

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) provides: An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, if the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary quitting means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer and requires an intention to terminate the employment. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W. 2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). 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); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

Claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2). "Good cause" for leaving employment must be that which is reasonable to the average person, not the overly sensitive individual or the claimant in particular. *Uniweld Products v. Indus. Relations Comm'n*, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973). The standard of what a reasonable person would have believed under the circumstances is applied in determining whether a claimant left work voluntarily with good cause attributable to the employer. *O'Brien v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (Iowa 1993).

Where a claimant gives numerous reasons for leaving employment the agency is required to consider all stated reasons which might combine to give the claimant good cause to quit in determining any of those reasons constitute good cause attributable to the employer. *Taylor v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 362 N.W.2d 534 (Iowa 1985).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(37) 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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:

(37) The claimant will be considered to have left employment voluntarily when such claimant gave the employer notice of an intention to resign and the employer accepted such resignation. . . .

Claimant's written resignation is both evidence of her intention to sever the employment relationship and an overt act of carrying out her intention. After submitting her resignation, claimant informed employer that she would stay if she received a raise in pay and one of her job duties was eliminated. Claimant's attempt to renegotiate the terms of her employment was not a withdrawal of her resignation. Employer accepted claimant's resignation on December 17, 2021. Claimant voluntarily quit her employment and has not established good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant has been overpaid benefits, but is not required to repay those benefits. Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview through no fault of its own; therefore, employer's account shall not be charged. The regular unemployment insurance benefit overpayment is charged to the fund.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(a)-(b) provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This

subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 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.

The unemployment insurance law 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. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

Because claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which claimant was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid UI in the gross amount of \$2,682.00 for nine-week period between December 19, 2021 and February 19, 2022. There is no evidence that claimant received these benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation. Furthermore, employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Therefore, claimant is not obligated to repay the UI benefits that claimant received.

While employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, it was not because employer failed to timely or adequately respond to IWD's request for information relating to the payment of benefits; no hearing was held. Accordingly employer's account cannot be charged. Because neither party is to be charged, the UI overpayment is absorbed by the fund.

DECISION:

The January 25, 2022 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to employer. Benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits in the gross amount of \$2,682.00 for nine-week period between December 19, 2021 and February 19, 2022 and is not obligated to repay those benefits to the agency. Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview through no fault of its own; employer's account shall not be charged. The regular unemployment insurance benefit overpayment must be charged to the fund.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

April 1, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/ACW