

**- DECISION -**

Claimant:  
ROBERTO ORANTES

Decision No.: 3944-BR-13

Date: September 18, 2013

Appeal No.: 1314394

Employer:  
MONUMENTAL VENDING INC

S.S. No.:

L.O. No.: 61

Appellant: Employer

Issue: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct or gross misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of Maryland Code, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 8-1002 or 1003.

---

**- 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 18, 2013

---

**REVIEW OF THE RECORD**

After a review of the record, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's findings of fact but finds that they 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*. 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.

The Board concurs with the hearing examiner that the claimant manifested the requisite intent to voluntarily quit when an indefinite leave of absence was not available.

In the instant case, the claimant quit for personal reasons which cannot be good cause within the meaning of § 8-1001(b) or valid circumstances within the meaning of § 8-1001(c)(1)(i) as a matter of law.

The claimant did not demonstrate that it was necessary for the him to quit because he was the only available primary caregiver for the ill individual. There is insufficient evidence that no one else was available to care for the ill individual. There is insufficient evidence that the ill individual was the claimant's parent or child. See *Lahood v. University of Maryland, Asian Division*, 2096-BR-92; *Leonard v. Sinai Hospital of Baltimore*, 684-BH-91; Cf. *Jenkins v. Echelon Service Company*, 1573-BR-91. The claimant did not sufficiently demonstrate that he had no reasonable alternative other than to quit. See *Williams v. National Applicators*, 539-BR-89; compare *Pyles v. Jems Contracting, Inc.*, 997-BR-91.

The Board finds insufficient evidence that the claimant demonstrated either necessitous or compelling reasons for quitting or that all reasonable alternatives were exhausted prior to quitting; therefore, a finding of valid circumstances within the meaning of § 8-1001(c)(1)(ii) is not supported.


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 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 hearing examiner's decision shall be reversed 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 March 24, 2013 and until the claimant becomes re-employed, earns at least fifteen times his weekly benefit amount and thereafter becomes unemployed through no fault of his own.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson

VD

Copies mailed to:

ROBERTO ORANTES

MONUMENTAL VENDING INC

Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

## **UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION**

ROBERTO ORANTES

SSN #

**Claimant**

vs.

MONUMENTAL VENDING 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: 1314394

Appellant: Employer

Local Office : 61 / COLLEGE PARK  
CLAIM CENTER

June 07, 2013

**For the Claimant:** PRESENT

**For the Employer:** PRESENT , JOE HORN

**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, Roberto Orantes, began working for this employer, Monumental Vending, Inc., on February 18, 2013. At the time of separation, the claimant was working on the employer's move crew. The claimant last worked for the employer on March 25, 2013, before quitting under the following circumstances:

Shortly before March 25, 2013, the claimant was notified that a relative in El Salvador was ill and did not have much longer to live. On March 25, 2013, the claimant informed the employer that he needed to go to El Salvador to visit his relative. The claimant was unable to give the employer a timeframe for when he

would be returning to Maryland and the claimant was told that the employer could not hold his position open indefinitely, but that he could check to see if there was an open position upon his return. The claimant left for El Salvador shortly thereafter.

## 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.

## 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 she 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, this burden has been met.

The claimant quit his job so that he could travel to El Salvador to see a terminally ill relative before their impending death. This is a purely personal reason for quitting. When one quits for purely personal reasons, no matter how compelling said reasons may be, good cause for the voluntary quit cannot be found. Board of Education of Montgomery County v. Paynter, 303 Md. 22, 491 A.2d 1186 (1985). Valid circumstances may be found where one quits for purely personal reasons if the reason for quitting is necessitous and compelling, and there is no reasonable alternative but to do so. The claimant must exhaust all reasonable alternatives. Wilson v. Vincent A. Butler and Associates, 1691-BR-93.

In the case at bar, the claimant's reason for quitting was certainly necessitous and compelling. Further, the only reasonable alternative that the claimant could have had was to take a leave of absence, however the employer's witness testified that the claimant was told that this option was not available to him. Since the claimant's reason for quitting was necessitous and compelling and he had no reasonable alternative but to quit, it is determined that the claimant has demonstrated that the reason for quitting rises to the level necessary to demonstrate valid circumstances within the meaning of the sections of law cited above.

## DECISION

IT IS HELD THAT the claimant's unemployment was due to leaving work voluntarily without good cause, but with valid circumstances within the meaning of Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1001. The claimant is disqualified for the week beginning March 24, 2013 and for the (four) 4 weeks immediately following. The claimant will then be eligible for benefits so long as all other eligibility requirements are met. The claimant may contact Claimant Information Service concerning the other eligibility requirements of the law at [ui@dllr.state.md.us](mailto:ui@dllr.state.md.us) or call 410-949-0022 from the Baltimore region, or 1-800-827-4839 from outside the Baltimore area. Deaf claimants with TTY may contact Client Information Service at 410-767-2727, or outside the Baltimore area at 1-800-827-4400.

The determination of the Claims Specialist is reversed.

*J. Nappier*

---

J. Nappier, 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

This is a final decision. 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 June 24, 2013. 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: May 28, 2013  
CH/Specialist ID: WCP4B  
Seq No: 001  
Copies mailed on June 07, 2013 to:  
ROBERTO ORANTES  
MONUMENTAL VENDING INC  
LOCAL OFFICE #61