

STATE OF FLORIDA
REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellee

R.A.A.C. Order No. 13-04377

vs.

Referee Decision No. 13-33356U

Employer/Appellant

ORDER OF REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

This case comes before the Commission for disposition of the employer's appeal pursuant to Section 443.151(4)(c), Florida Statutes, of a referee's decision which held the claimant not disqualified from receipt of benefits.

Pursuant to the appeal filed in this case, the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission has conducted a complete review of the evidentiary hearing record and decision of the appeals referee. *See* §443.151(4)(c), Fla. Stat. By law, the Commission's review is limited to those matters that were presented to the referee and are contained in the official record.

Procedural error requires this case to be remanded for further proceedings; accordingly, the Commission does not now address the issue of whether the claimant is eligible/qualified for benefits.

The referee's findings of fact state as follows:

The claimant worked as a full-time laborer for a company from August 3, 2012 through August 16, 2012. The claimant's supervisor told the claimant to drive "undocumented" people. The claimant spoke with a police officer about it, and the police officer told the claimant that it was not permitted. The claimant told his supervisor. The claimant's supervisor continued to want him to do so. The claimant told his supervisor that he was separating at that time for driving undocumented people illegally.

Based on these findings, the referee held the claimant voluntarily left work with good cause attributable to the employing unit. Upon review of the record and the arguments on appeal, the Commission concludes the record was not sufficiently developed; consequently, the case must be remanded.

At the hearing before the appeals referee, the claimant testified he quit his employment because the employer's owner required him to transport "undocumented" workers. He testified he asked a Hialeah police officer if transporting "undocumented" workers would lead to problems for him or the company and the officer indicated that transporting such workers could create problems for him in his individual capacity. Lastly, the claimant testified that when he questioned the employer's administrative assistant about having to transport "undocumented" workers, she denied having knowledge of the situation.

On appeal to the Commission, the employer asserts the claimant quit due to the distance from his home to the jobsite and disputes the claimant's allegation that he was required to transport "undocumented" workers. We note that the claimant's appeal of the April 16, 2013 determination holding him disqualified from receipt of benefits does not address the reason he separated from his employment. Consequently, we find the employer had no notice that the claimant would argue he was required to transport "undocumented" workers.

The employer's assertions on appeal indicate the employer was surprised by the claimant's testimony. To ensure each party receives a fair hearing, the referee's decision is vacated and the case is remanded for a supplemental hearing in order to provide the employer with an opportunity to rebut the claimant's testimony that he voluntarily left his employment because he was required to transport "undocumented" workers. *See Montalbano v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 873 So. 2d 417, 419 (Fla. 4th DCA 2004); *see also Penton v. Royal Crown Bottling Company of Chicago*, 646 So. 2d 267 (Fla. 1st DCA 1994).

In addition to the foregoing, the referee must clarify what the claimant meant when he identified his coworkers as "undocumented" workers. *See Fla. Admin. Code R. 73B-20.024(3)(b)*. The referee may also inquire with the employer regarding the employer's compliance as to these employees with the relevant provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act ("IRCA"), as amended, relating to employee verification, and whether the employer knew the employees at issue were *not* authorized to work in the United States. However, this is the limit of the referee's permissible inquiry into these issues. While IRCA prohibits an employer from *knowingly* hiring an unauthorized alien, or failing to comply with the documentation procedures established pursuant to IRCA, (8 U.S.C. §1324a(a)(1)), or continuing to employ an employee who the employer *knows* lacks authorization, (8 U.S.C.

§1324a(a)(2)), IRCA also prohibits an employer from discriminating on the basis of national origin, and improper discrimination may include requiring more or additional documentation where the documents provided are facially sufficient. (8 U.S.C. §1324b(a)). It is neither the employer's right nor responsibility to enforce the immigration laws, beyond the specific requirements listed above, and an employer who, in good faith, properly complies with the established documentation procedures, including use of the I-9 form or *E-Verify*, is considered to have a defense against any claim of violation of 8 U.S.C. §1324a(a)(1)(A). *See* 8 U.S.C. §1324a(a)(3); 8 C.F.R. §274a.4. Thus, the issue in this case is not whether or not the claimant was asked to transport "undocumented" workers, but rather, whether the employer instructed him to transport employees the *employer* knew were not authorized or had not been documented by the employer.

On remand, the employer must be provided an opportunity to rebut the claimant's assertion that he left his employment because his employer required him to transport "undocumented" workers. In addition, the referee must require the claimant to clarify what he means when he utilizes the phrase "undocumented" worker. The referee must then render a new decision based upon the supplemented record.

The decision of the appeals referee is vacated and the case is remanded for further proceedings.

It is so ordered.

REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

Frank E. Brown, Chairman
Thomas D. Epsky, Member
Joseph D. Finnegan, Member

This is to certify that on
8/8/2013,
the above Order was filed in the office of
the Clerk of the Reemployment
Assistance Appeals Commission, and a
copy mailed to the last known address
of each interested party.
By: Natasha Green
Deputy Clerk



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Reemployment Assistance Appeals
MSC 344 CALDWELL BUILDING
107 EAST MADISON STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-4143

IMPORTANT: For free translation assistance, you may call 1-800-204-2418. Please do not delay, as there is a limited time to appeal.
IMPORTANTE: Para recibir ayuda gratuita con traducciones, puede llamar al 1-800-204-2418. Por favor hágalo lo antes posible, ya que el tiempo para apelar es limitado.
ENPÒTAN: Pou yon intèpret asistè ou gratis, nou gendwa rélé 1-800-204-2418. Sil vou plè pa pran àmpil tòn, paské tòn limité pou ou ranpli apèl la.

Docket No. 2013-33356U

Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

CLAIMANT/Appellant

EMPLOYER/Appellee

APPEARANCES: CLAIMANT & EMPLOYER

LOCAL OFFICE #: 3649-0

DECISION OF APPEALS REFEREE

Important appeal rights are explained at the end of this decision.

Derechos de apelación importantes son explicados al final de esta decisión.

Yo eksplike kèk dwa dapèl enpòtan lan fen desizyon sa a.

Issues Involved:

SEPARATION: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work or voluntarily left work without good cause as defined in the statute, pursuant to Sections 443.101(1), (9), (10), (11); 443.036(30), Florida Statutes; Rule 73B-11.020, Florida Administrative Code.

Findings of Fact: The claimant worked as a full-time laborer for a company from August 3, 2012, through August 16, 2012. The claimant's supervisor told the claimant to drive "undocumented" people. The claimant spoke with a police officer about it, and the police officer told the claimant that it was not permitted. The claimant told his supervisor. The claimant's supervisor continued to want him to do so. The claimant told his supervisor that he was separating at that time for driving undocumented people illegally.

Conclusions of Law: The law provides that a claimant who voluntarily left work without good cause as defined in the statute will be disqualified for benefits. "Good cause" includes only cause attributable to the

employing unit or illness or disability of the claimant requiring separation from the work. However, a claimant who voluntarily left work to return immediately when called to work by a permanent employing unit that temporarily terminated the claimant's work within the previous 6 calendar months, or to relocate due to a military-connected spouse's permanent change of station, activation, or unit deployment orders, is not subject to this disqualification.

The record reflects that the claimant quit. The burden of proof is on the claimant who voluntarily quit work to show by a preponderance of the evidence that quitting was with good cause. Uniweld Products, Inc., v. Industrial Relations Commission, 277 So.2d 827 (Fla. 4th DCA 1973). The evidence provided indicates that the claimant was asked to do something that he was told was not permitted. The claimant was uncomfortable about performing the task and expressed his concerns to his employer. As the claimant made sufficient effort to resolve the concerns prior to leaving, the claimant was shown to have quit with good cause. Therefore, the claimant is qualified for the receipt of benefits.

The hearing officer was presented with conflicting testimony regarding material issues of fact and is charged with resolving these conflicts. The Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission set forth factors to be considered in resolving credibility questions. These include the witness' opportunity and capacity to observe the event or act in question; any prior inconsistent statement by the witness; witness bias or lack of bias; the contradiction of the witness' version of events by other evidence or its consistency with other evidence; the inherent improbability of the witness' version of events; and the witness' demeanor. Upon considering these factors, the hearing officer finds the testimony of the claimant to be more credible. Therefore, material conflicts in the evidence are resolved in favor of the claimant.

Decision: The determination dated April 8, 2013, is REVERSED. The claimant is qualified for the receipt of benefits.

If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination, unless specified in this decision. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

This is to certify that a copy of the above decision was mailed to the last known address of each interested party on May 16, 2013.

M. GIRVIN
Appeals Referee

By: 
DESYREE JONES, Deputy Clerk

IMPORTANT - APPEAL RIGHTS: This decision will become final unless a written request for review or reopening is filed within 20 calendar days after the mailing date shown. If the 20th day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday defined in F.A.C. 73B-21.004, filing may be made on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or holiday. If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown below and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

A party who did not attend the hearing for good cause may request reopening, including the reason for not attending, at <https://iap.floridajobs.org/> or by writing to the address at the top of this decision. The date the confirmation number is generated will be the filing date of a request for reopening on the Appeals Web Site.

A party who attended the hearing and received an adverse decision may file a request for review to the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); <https://raaciap.floridajobs.org/>. If mailed, the postmark date will be the filing date. If faxed, hand-delivered, delivered by courier service other than the United States Postal Service, or submitted via the Internet, the date of receipt will be the filing date. To avoid delay, include the docket number and claimant's social security number. A party requesting review should specify any and all allegations of error with respect to the referee's decision, and provide factual and/or legal support for these challenges. Allegations of error not specifically set forth in the request for review may be considered waived.

IMPORTANTE - DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN: Esta decisión pasará a ser final a menos que una solicitud por escrito para revisión o reapertura se registre dentro de 20 días de calendario después de la fecha marcada en que la decisión fue remitida por correo. Si el vigésimo (20) día es un sábado, un domingo o un feriado definidos en F.A.C. 73B-21.004, el registro de la solicitud se puede realizar en el día siguiente que no sea un sábado, un domingo o un feriado. Si esta decisión descalifica y/o declara al reclamante como inelegible para recibir

beneficios que ya fueron recibidos por el reclamante, se le requerirá al reclamante rembolsar esos beneficios. La cantidad específica de cualquier sobrepago [*pago excesivo de beneficios*] será calculada por la Agencia y establecida en una determinación de pago excesivo de beneficios que será emitida por separado. Sin embargo, el límite de tiempo para solicitar la revisión de esta decisión es como se establece anteriormente y dicho límite no es detenido, demorado o extendido por ninguna otra determinación, decisión u orden.

Una parte que no asistió a la audiencia por una buena causa puede solicitar una reapertura, incluyendo la razón por no haber comparecido en la audiencia, en <https://iap.floridajobs.org/> o escribiendo a la dirección en la parte superior de esta decisión. La fecha en que se genera el número de confirmación será la fecha de registro de una solicitud de reapertura realizada en el Sitio Web de la Oficina de Apelaciones.

Una parte que asistió a la audiencia y recibió una decisión adversa puede registrar una solicitud de revisión con la Comisión de Apelaciones de Desempleo; Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); <https://raaciap.floridajobs.org/>. Si la solicitud es enviada por correo, la fecha del sello de la oficina de correos será la fecha de registro de la solicitud. Si es enviada por telefax, entregada a mano, entregada por servicio de mensajería, con la excepción del Servicio Postal de Estados Unidos, o realizada vía el Internet, la fecha en la que se recibe la solicitud será la fecha de registro. Para evitar demora, incluya el número de expediente [*docket number*] y el número de seguro social del reclamante. Una parte que solicita una revisión debe especificar cualquiera y todos los alegatos de error con respecto a la decisión del árbitro, y proporcionar fundamentos reales y/o legales para substanciar éstos desafíos. Los alegatos de error que no se establezcan con especificidad en la solicitud de revisión pueden considerarse como renunciados.

ENPÒTAN – DWA DAPÈL: Desizyon sa a ap definitiv sòf si ou depoze yon apèl nan yon delè 20 jou apre dat nou poste sa a ba ou. Si 20^{yèm} jou a se yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje, jan sa defini lan F.A.C. 73B-21.004, depo an kapab fèt jou aprè a, si se pa yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje. Si desizyon an diskalifye epi/oswa deklare moun k ap fè demann lan pa kalifye pou alokasyon li resevwa deja, moun k ap fè demann lan ap gen pou li remèt lajan li te resevwa a. Se Ajans lan k ap kalkile montan nenpòt ki peman anplis epi y ap detèmine sa lan yon desizyon separe. Sepandan, delè pou mande revizyon desizyon sa a se delè yo bay anwo a; Okenn lòt detèminasyon, desizyon oswa lòd pa ka rete, retade oubyen pwolonje dat sa a.

Yon pati ki te gen yon rezon valab pou li pat asiste seyans lan gen dwa mande pou yo ouvri ka a ankò; fòk yo bay rezon yo pat ka vini an epi fè demann nan sou sitwèb sa a, <https://iap.floridajobs.org/> oswa alekri nan adrès ki mansyone okomansman desizyon sa a. Dat yo pwodui nimewo konfimasyon an se va dat yo prezante demann nan pou reouvri kòz la sou Sitwèb Apèl la.

Yon pati ki te asiste seyans la epi ki pat satisfè desizyon yo te pran an gen dwa mande yon revizyon nan men Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); <https://raaciap.floridajobs.org/>. Si ou voye l pa lapòs, dat ki sou tenb la ap dat ou depoze apèl la. Si ou depoze apèl la sou yon sitwèb, ou fakse li, bay li men nan laman, oswa voye li pa yon sèvis mesajri ki pa Sèvis Lapòs Lèzetazini (*United States Postal Service*), oswa voye li pa Entènèt, dat ki sou resi a se va dat depo a. Pou evite reta, mete nimewo rejis la (*docket number*) avèk nimewo sekirite sosyal moun k ap fè demann lan. Yon pati k ap mande revizyon dwe presize nenpòt ki alegasyon erè nan kad desizyon abit la, epi bay baz reyèl oubyen legal pou apiye alegasyon sa yo. Yo p ap pran an konsiderasyon alegasyon erè ki pa byen presize nan demann pou revizyon an.