

- DECISION -

Claimant:
MICHAEL F MOONEY

Decision No.: 4689-BR-12

Date: September 26, 2012

Appeal No.: 1219590

S.S. No.:

Employer:
ONEIDA COMMUNICATIONS INC

L.O. No.: 64

Appellant: Claimant

Issue: 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 Maryland Rules of Procedure, Title 7, Chapter 200.

The period for filing an appeal expires: October 26, 2012

REVIEW OF THE RECORD

After a review of the record, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's findings of fact and conclusions of law. However the Board corrects the start date of the claimant's penalty.

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*. The Board fully inquires into the facts of each particular case. *COMAR 09.32.06.03(E)(1)*.

“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. App. 250, 274 (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).

There are two categories of non-disqualifying reasons for quitting employment. 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.

Quitting for “good cause” is the first non-disqualifying reason. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-1001(b)*. 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, 28 (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, 29-30 (1985)(requiring a “higher standard of proof” than for good cause because reason is not job related); *also see Bohrer v. Sheetz, Inc., Law No. 13361, (Cir. Ct. for Washington Co., Apr. 24, 1984)*. “Good cause” must be job-related and it must be a cause “which would reasonably impel the average, able-bodied, qualified worker to give up his or her employment.” *Paynter*, 303 Md. at 1193. Using this definition, the Court of Appeals held that the Board correctly applied the “objective test”: “The applicable standards are the standards of reasonableness applied to the average man or woman, and not to the supersensitive.” *Paynter*, 303 Md. at 1193.

The second category or non-disqualifying reason is quitting for “valid circumstances”. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-1001(c)(1)*. There are three types of valid circumstances: a valid circumstance may be (1) a substantial cause that is job-related or (2) a factor that is non-job related but is “necessitous or compelling”. *Paynter* 202 Md. at 30; (3) when the claimant’s quit is caused by the individual leaving employment (i) to follow a spouse serving in the United States military or (ii) because the claimant’s spouse is a civilian employee of the military or of a federal agency involved with military operations and the spouse’s employer requires a mandatory transfer to a new location. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl.*

Art., §8-1001(c)(1)(iii). 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, 30 (1985). 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.

The claimant made the decision to quit this employment and gave his employer two weeks notice. When the claimant publicized to his co-workers the employer’s offer of a raise the employer accelerated the claimant’s last day of work. This action on the part of the employer did not convert the claimant’s voluntary quit into a discharge. However the claimant’s penalty start day will be corrected to commence as of the end of the claimant’s notice period. *See Stefan v. Levenson and Klein 1794-BR-92*.

The Board finds based on a preponderance of the credible evidence that the claimant did not meet his burden of demonstrating that he quit for good cause or valid circumstances within the meaning of § 8-1001. The decision shall be modified for the reasons stated herein.


DECISION

It is held that the unemployment of the claimant was due to leaving work voluntarily, without good cause or 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 April 29, 2012 and until the claimant becomes re-employed, earns at least fifteen times their weekly benefit amount and thereafter becomes unemployed through no fault of their own.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is modified.



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member

RD

Copies mailed to:

MICHAEL F. MOONEY

ONEIDA COMMUNICATIONS INC

Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION

MICHAEL F MOONEY

SSN #

Claimant

vs.

ONEIDA COMMUNICATIONS INC

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: 1219590
Appellant: Employer
Local Office : 64 / BALTOMETRO
CALL CENTER

June 26, 2012

For the Claimant: PRESENT

For the Employer: PRESENT, CHARLES HIGGINS, DENISE ST. JEAN

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 8-1001 (voluntary quit for good cause), 8-1002 - 1002.1 (gross/aggravated misconduct connected with the work) or 8-1003 (misconduct connected with the work).

FINDINGS OF FACT

The claimant, Michael Mooney, was employed with Oneida Communications, Inc. from January 4, 2011 to April 20, 2012. At the time of separation, he was working full time as a backhoe technician, earning \$24.00 per hour. The claimant voluntarily quit the job to accept employment elsewhere.

The claimant accepted a full time job with Caton's Plumbing which paid \$24.00 per hour. The job started April 30, 2012. The reason the claimant took the job was that it was closer to his home and he would save money on gas. He would have to drive only 22 miles instead of the 70 miles he drove to the old employer's location. The claimant knew the old employer's location when he accepted the job.

On April 16, 2012, the claimant gave the old employer two weeks notice and stated that his last day would

be April 27, 2012. Charles Higgins, the president, offered the claimant a \$5.00 per hour raise if he would stay, but the claimant refused, citing the cost of gas and driving distance.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Higgins learned that the claimant told his crew members about the raise he was offered. Mr. Higgins had told the claimant that his offer of a raise was between him and the claimant. As a result of the claimant's violating this confidence, Mr. Higgins instructed the claimant's supervisor to advise the claimant that April 20, 2012 would be his last day, instead of April 27, 2012.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1001 provides that an individual is disqualified from receiving benefits when unemployment is due to leaving work voluntarily. The Court of Appeals interpreted Section 8-1001 in Allen v. CORE Target City Youth Program, 275 Md. 69, 338 A.2d 237 (1975): "As we see it, the phrase 'leaving work voluntarily' has a plain, definite and sensible meaning...; 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, of his or her own free will, terminated the employment." 275 Md. at 79.

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.

In Total Audio-Visual Systems, Inc. v. DLLR, 360 Md. 387 (2000), the Court held that an individual who has left his or her employment to accept other employment has not left his or her job for good cause as defined in Section 8-1001(b)(1) of the Labor & Employment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland. This is because quitting ones job for purely economic reasons is neither necessitous nor compelling. See also Plein v. Dept of Labor Licensing & Regulation, 369 Md. 421, 800 A.2d 757 (2002); Gagne v. Potomac Talking Book Services, Inc., 374-BH-03.

However, a finding of valid circumstances is appropriate if the claimant can show that accepting the alternative employment was "of such a necessitous and compelling nature that the individual had no reasonable alternative other than leaving the employment." Gaskins v. UPS, 1686-BR-00.

EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE

The Hearing Examiner considered all of the testimony and evidence of record in reaching this decision. Where the evidence was in conflict, the Hearing Examiner decided the Facts on the credible evidence as determined by the Hearing Examiner.

The claimant had the burden to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he voluntarily quit his position for reasons that constitute either good cause or valid circumstances pursuant to the Maryland Unemployment Insurance Law. Hargrove v. City of Baltimore, 2033-BH-83. In this case, the claimant failed to meet this burden.

The claimant voluntarily quit his job in order to accept employment elsewhere. In accordance with the above-cited case, quitting for this reason does not constitute good cause. Also, the claimant failed to produce sufficient credible evidence to support a finding of valid circumstances so necessitous and compelling that he had no alternative but to quit the job. The employer accelerated the claimant's last day of work and let him go before the end of his notice period after the claimant violated the employer's confidence by telling other employees about the raise offered by the employer.

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 April 15, 2012, 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 reversed.



R M Tabackman, 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 either 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 July 11, 2012. 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: June 19, 2012

BLP/Specialist ID: RBA17

Seq No: 001

Copies mailed on June 26, 2012 to:

MICHAEL F. MOONEY
ONEIDA COMMUNICATIONS INC
LOCAL OFFICE #64