

- DECISION -

Claimant:
AMANDA L AHMED

Decision No.: 2624-BR-12

Date: May 31, 2012

Appeal No.: 1204484

Employer:
NORDSTROM INC

S.S. No.:

L.O. No.: 65

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: July 02, 2012

REVIEW OF THE RECORD

After a review of the record, and after correcting the third sentence of the second paragraph to reflect the fact that the nearest store to the claimant's new residence was 2.5 hours (not miles) away, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's modified findings of fact and conclusions 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*. 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 two 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. 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.

In her appeal, the claimant reiterates her testimony from the hearing. She asserts she has a financial need for benefits and contends she cannot repay an overpayment. On appeal, the Board reviews the evidence of record from the Lower Appeals hearing. The Board has conducted a thorough review of the record and finds the hearing examiner misinterpreted the applicable law. The hearing examiner interpreted §8-1001(d) to preclude the claimant. That section excepts spouses of military personnel §8-1001(c)(1)(iii). Contrary to the hearing examiner's statement, the claimant did not have to have lost her sponsorship and become legally unable to continue in her job. The claimant only had to be married to a member of the military. Specifically, §8-1001 says:

(c) Valid circumstances. – (1) A circumstance of voluntarily leaving work is valid only if it is: ...

(iii) caused by the individual leaving employment to follow a spouse if:

1. the spouse:

A. serves in the United States military; or ...

The evidence was undisputed that the claimant left her employment with this employer only because her husband, an active-duty of the U. S. Army, was transferred to another state and the claimant could not, herself, transfer with the employer to a location near her new residence. The claimant had valid circumstances for leaving this employment.

The issue of an overpayment, or the recoupment thereof, was not before the hearing examiner and is not before the Board. The claimant must first file an appeal to any overpayment determination before the matter could be scheduled for hearing.

The Board 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 further notes that the claimant could not establish good cause for her decision to leave this employment, because the reason underlying that decision was not related to the employment, but was personal.

The Board finds based on a preponderance of the credible evidence that the claimant did not meet her burden of demonstrating that she quit this employment for good cause within the meaning of §8-1001. However the claimant has established that she had valid circumstances for quitting. The decision shall be affirmed for the reasons stated herein and in the hearing examiner's decision.

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 4, 2011 and the four weeks immediately following.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member

RD

Copies mailed to:

AMANDA L. AHMED

NORDSTROM INC

NORDSTROM INC

Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary