# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

**KELVIN G SCHILLING** 

Claimant

**APPEAL 16A-UI-12807-CL-T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

WITHAM AUTO CENTERS INC

Employer

OC: 11/06/16

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

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:

The employer filed an appeal from the November 28, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on December 16, 2016. Claimant participated. Employer participated through vice president/owner Tim Godfrey.

## **ISSUES:**

Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer? Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived? Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer in May 2006. Claimant last worked as a full-time salesman. Claimant was separated from employment on November 2, 2016, when he returned to work with restrictions employer could not accommodate.

Claimant injured his back in a non-work related incident in February 2016. He notified the employer that he needed to leave work because of his back condition. He and the employer understood that he would return to work after he recovered from his injury.

Claimant underwent back surgery in May 2016. On November 2, 2016, claimant's doctor released him to return to work on November 7, 2016, but limited him to working four hours per day and restricted him from lifting and performing snow removal. Claimant was able to do very little with one of his arms after the surgery and will need to undergo a second surgery in an attempt to correct this issue.

On November 2, 2016, claimant presented employer with his restrictions. Employer has no positions that will accommodate claimant's restrictions. Employer explained this to claimant on November 2, 2016.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1691.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of November 6, 2016, for five weeks until the week ending December 10, 2016. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview.

# **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue in this case is whether the claimant voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code Section 96.5-1-d establishes conditions for qualifying for unemployment insurance benefits after leaving work due to an illness or injury. Those conditions are interpreted in the unemployment insurance rules.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(6)a provides:

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.

The claimant left work due to a non-work-related injury upon advice of a physician and with notification to his employer. At the point that the claimant returned to work, however, he was not able to perform all the duties of his job. Consequently he is subject to disqualification until he is paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount or offers to return to work after fully recovering from his injury but is not rehired by the employer.

The next issue is whether claimant was overpaid benefits and should have to repay those benefits. 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 § 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 § 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 states pursuant to § 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 lowa Code § 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 lowa Code § 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 lowa Code § 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 lowa Code § 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 lowa Code § 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he was not entitled. 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. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall be charged.

## **DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated November 28, 2016, (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant is subject to disqualification until he is paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount or offers to return to work after fully recovering from his injury but is not rehired by the employer. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1691.00 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Christine A. Louis Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/