-DECISION-

Claimant:

Decision No.:

2086-BR-11

FREDERICK E WOOD

Date:

May 11, 2011

Appeal No.:

1034078

S.S. No.:

Employer:

NEW WEST TECHNOLOGIES LLC

L.O. No .:

64

Appellant:

Claimant

Whether the claimant left work voluntarily, without good cause within the meaning of Maryland Code, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 1001.

- NOTICE OF RIGHT OF APPEAL TO COURT -

You may file an appeal from this decision in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City or one of the Circuit Courts in a county in Maryland. The court rules about how to file the appeal can be found in many public libraries, in the <u>Maryland Rules of Procedure</u>. Title 7, Chapter 200.

The period for filing an appeal expires: June 10, 2011

REVIEW ON THE RECORD

After a review on the record, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's findings of fact but finds that the facts warrant a different conclusion of law.

The General Assembly declared that, in its considered judgment, the public good and the general welfare of the citizens of the State required the enactment of the Unemployment Insurance Law, under the police powers of the State, for the compulsory setting aside of unemployment reserves to be used for the benefit of individuals unemployed through no fault of their own. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-102(c)*. Unemployment compensation laws are to be read liberally in favor of eligibility, and disqualification provisions are to be strictly construed. *Sinai Hosp. of Baltimore v. Dept. of Empl. & Training, 309 Md. 28 (1987)*.

The Board reviews the record *de novo* and may affirm, modify, or reverse the findings of fact or conclusions of law of the hearing examiner on the basis of evidence submitted to the hearing examiner, or evidence that the Board may direct to be taken, or may remand any case to a hearing examiner for purposes it may direct. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-510(d)*; *COMAR 09.32.06.04(H)(1)*. The Board fully inquires into the facts of each particular case. *COMAR 09.32.06.02(E)*.

When a claimant voluntarily leaves work, he has the burden of proving that he left for good cause or valid circumstances based upon a preponderance of the credible evidence in the record. Hargrove v. City of Baltimore, 2033-BH-83; Chisholm v. Johns Hopkins Hospital, 66-BR-89. Purely personal reasons, no matter how compelling, cannot constitute good cause as a matter of law. Bd. Of Educ. Of Montgomery County v. Paynter, 303 Md. 22 (1985). An objective standard is used to determine if the average employee would have left work in that situation; in addition, a determination is made as to whether a particular employee left in good faith, and an element of good faith is whether the claimant has exhausted all reasonable alternatives before leaving work. Board of Educ. v. Paynter, 303 Md. 22 (1985); also see Bohrer v. Sheetz, Inc., Law No. 13361, (Cir. Ct. for Washington Co., Apr. 24, 1984). The "necessitous or compelling" requirement relating to a cause for leaving work voluntarily does not apply to "good cause". Board of Educ. v. Paynter, 303 Md. 22 (1985).

"Due to leaving work voluntarily" has a plain, definite and sensible meaning, free of ambiguity. It expresses a clear legislative intent that to disqualify a claimant from benefits, the evidence must establish that the claimant, by his or her own choice, intentionally and of his or her own free will, terminated the employment. Allen v. Core Target Youth Program, 275 Md. 69 (1975). A claimant's intent or state of mind is a factual issue for the Board of Appeals to resolve. Dept. of Econ. & Empl. Dev. v. Taylor, 108 Md. 250(1996), aff'd sub. nom., 344 Md. 687 (1997). An intent to quit one's job can be manifested by actions as well as words. Lawson v. Security Fence Supply Company, 1101-BH-82. In a case where medical problems are at issue, mere compliance with the requirement of supplying a written statement or other documentary evidence of a health problem does not mandate an automatic award of benefits. Shifflet v. Dept. of Emp. & Training, 75 Md. App. 282 (1988).

Section 8-1001 of the Labor and Employment Article provides that individuals shall be disqualified from the receipt of benefits where their unemployment is due to leaving work voluntarily, without good cause arising from or connected with the conditions of employment or actions of the employer or without, valid circumstances. A circumstance for voluntarily leaving work is valid if it is a substantial cause that is directly attributable to, arising from, or connected with the conditions of employment or actions of the employing unit or of such necessitous or compelling nature that the individual had no reasonable alternative other than leaving the employment.

In his appeal, the claimant reiterates his testimony from the hearing and contends that his multiple health issues precluded him from continuing with this employment. The claimant also contends that he did not voluntarily quit. While the claimant may not have wanted to leave this employment, he did sever the employment relationship due to the stated health problems. His leaving therefore was a voluntary quit. The claimant also includes multiple medical documents in support of his position.

Because the claimant's reasons for leaving this employment were personal and not related to the employment, he cannot establish that he had good cause for quitting this position. However, contrary to the hearing examiner's finding that he did not meet the criteria for valid circumstances because he did not exhaust all possible alternatives, the Board finds that the claimant should not be required to take further steps when he was advised by his physician that he could not return to work for months. The claimant was a project manager and knew the critical and time-sensitive nature of the employer's work. A leave of absence would have been impractical under these circumstances.

The Board notes that the claimant's health problems may have rendered him unable to work for a period of time, making his also ineligible for benefits. However, that issue is not before the Board at this time.

The Board also notes that the hearing examiner did not offer or admit the *Agency Fact Finding Report* into evidence. The Board did not consider this document when rendering its decision.

The Board finds based on a preponderance of the credible evidence that the claimant did not meet his burden of demonstrating that he quit this employment for good cause. However the claimant has meet his burden and established that he had valid circumstances within the meaning of \S 8-1001 for quitting this employment. The decision shall be reversed for the reasons stated herein.

The employer, provided that the employer has not elected to be a reimbursing employer pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., §8-616, et seq., should note that any benefits paid to the claimant as a result of this decision shall not affect its earned (tax) rating record. See Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-611(e)(1).

DECISION

It is held that the claimant left work voluntarily, without good cause but for valid circumstances, within the meaning of Maryland Code Annotated, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 1001. The claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits from the week beginning December 19, 2009 and the four weeks immediately following.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.

Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson

Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member

Some Watt Tomort

RD/mw
Copies mailed to:
FREDERICK E. WOOD
NEW WEST TECHNOLOGIES LLC
NEW WEST TECHNOLOGIES LLC
Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION

FREDERICK E WOOD

SSN#

Claimant

VS.

NEW WEST TECHNOLOGIES LLC

Employer/Agency

Before the:

Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation Division of Appeals 1100 North Eutaw Street Room 511 Baltimore, MD 21201 (410) 767-2421

Appeal Number: 1034078 Appellant: Claimant

Local Office: 64 / BALTOMETRO

CALL CENTER

October 08, 2010

For the Claimant: PRESENT

For the Employer:

For the Agency:

ISSUE(S)

Whether the claimant's separation from this employment was for a disqualifying reason within the meaning of the MD. Code Annotated, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Sections 1001 (Voluntary Quit for good cause), 1002 - 1002.1 (Gross/Aggravated Misconduct connected with the work), or 1003 (Misconduct connected with the work).

FINDINGS OF FACT

The claimant worked for the above-captioned employer from the summer of 2009 through December 17, 2010. The claimant earned approximately \$50 per hour while working part time as a senior project officer.

The claimant had surgery on December 18, 2009 and suffered complications as a result; further he had some other medical issues. The claimant was advised by his doctor on January 6, 2010 to temporarily stop working until July 1, 2010. The claimant stopped working. The claimant did not speak with the employer about a leave of absence or any other accommodations that could be made.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1001 provides that an individual shall be disqualified for benefits where unemployment is due to leaving work voluntarily without good cause arising from or connected with the conditions of employment or actions of the employer, or without valid circumstances. A circumstance is valid only if it is (i) a substantial cause that is directly attributable to, arising from, or connected with conditions of employment or actions of the employing unit; or (ii) of such necessitous or compelling nature that the individual has no reasonable alternative other than leaving the employment.

EVALUATION OF THE EVIDENCE

The credible evidence presented at the hearing shows that the claimant voluntarily quit this position. In a voluntary quit case, the claimant has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the credible evidence presented at the hearing that the quit was for either good cause or valid circumstances, as those terms are defined above.

In the instant case the claimant quit for reasons not attributed to the terms and conditions of employment. Therefore, neither good cause nor the first definition of valid circumstances applies. Additionally, the claimant has failed to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives were exhausted prior to quitting. In particular, the claimant failed to show that there was no choice but to quit.

DECISION

IT IS HELD THAT the claimant's unemployment was due to leaving work voluntarily without good cause or valid circumstances within the meaning of Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1001. Benefits are denied for the week beginning December 13, 2009 and until the claimant becomes reemployed and earns at least 15 times the claimant's weekly benefit amount in covered wages and thereafter becomes unemployed through no fault of the claimant.

The determination of the Claims Specialist is modified.

DW Purdie

D W Purdie, Esq. Hearing Examiner

Notice of Right to Request Waiver of Overpayment

The Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation may seek recovery of any overpayment received by the Claimant. Pursuant to Section 8-809 of the Labor and Employment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, and Code of Maryland Regulations 09.32.07.01 through 09.32.07.09, the Claimant has a right to request a waiver of recovery of this overpayment.

This request may be made by contacting Overpayment Recoveries Unit at 410-767-2404. If this request is made, the Claimant is entitled to a hearing on this issue.

A request for waiver of recovery of overpayment does not act as an appeal of this decision.

Esto es un documento legal importante que decide si usted recibirá los beneficios del seguro del desempleo. Si usted disiente de lo que fue decidido, usted tiene un tiempo limitado a apelar esta decisión. Si usted no entiende cómo apelar, usted puede contactar (301) 313-8000 para una explicación.

Notice of Right of Further Appeal

Any party may request a further appeal <u>either</u> in person, by facsimile or by mail with the Board of Appeals. Under COMAR 09.32.06.01A (1) appeals may not be filed by e-mail. Your appeal must be filed by October 25, 2010. You may file your request for further appeal in person at or by mail to the following address:

Board of Appeals 1100 North Eutaw Street Room 515 Baltimore, Maryland 21201 Fax 410-767-2787 Phone 410-767-2781

NOTE: Appeals filed by mail are considered timely on the date of the U.S. Postal Service postmark.

Date of hearing: October 05, 2010 CH/Specialist ID: RBA2M Seq No: 002 Copies mailed on October 08, 2010 to: FREDERICK E. WOOD NEW WEST TECHNOLOGIES LLC LOCAL OFFICE #64 NEW WEST TECHNOLOGIES LLC