

**- DECISION -**

Claimant:  
STACEY A JENKINS

Decision No.: 4901-BR-12

Date: December 07, 2012

Appeal No.: 1215963

Employer:  
UPPER CHESAPEAKE HEALTH SYSTEMS  
INC

S.S. No.:

L.O. No.: 63

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: January 07, 2013

---

**REVIEW OF THE RECORD**

After a review of the record, and after deleting "or about" from the first and third sentences of the first paragraph, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's modified findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Board, however, modifies the hearing examiner's decision to reduce the number of penalty weeks imposed.

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 offers no specific contentions of error as to the findings of fact or the conclusions of law in the hearing examiner's decision. The claimant does not cite to the evidence of record and makes no other contentions of error. The claimant's appeal ostensibly consisted of three pages, however, only the cover page contained any information.

On appeal, the Board reviews the evidence of record from the Lower Appeals hearing. The Board will not order the taking of additional evidence or a new hearing unless there has been clear error, a defect in the record, or a failure of due process. The record is complete. Both parties appeared and testified. Both parties were given the opportunity to cross-examine opposing witnesses and to offer and object to documentary evidence. Both parties were offered closing statements. The necessary elements of due process were observed throughout the hearing. The Board finds no reason to order a new hearing or take additional evidence in this matter.

The Board has thoroughly reviewed the record from the hearing and concurs with the hearing examiner's findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Board finds, however, that the hearing examiner imposed too lengthy a penalty and modifies the decision in that regard.

The claimant testified to several instances which led to her decision to quit this employment. All were related to or connected with the employment. The claimant took her concerns to the employer on several occasions, but the employer was not as responsive as the claimant had hoped or wanted. The claimant did not pursue her complaints any further with anyone in a higher position of authority. Because the claimant still had options available to her when she quit, she cannot show that she had good cause for leaving this employment. She did demonstrate that her leaving was based upon valid circumstances. A five-week benefit disqualification is the more appropriate penalty under these conditions.

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 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 claimant is


disqualified from the receipt of benefits for the week beginning February 12, 2012, and for the next four weeks thereafter. The decision shall be affirmed, as modified, 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 February 12, 2012, and the four weeks immediately following.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is Modified.



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member

TBW

Copies mailed to:

STACEY A. JENKINS  
UPPER CHESAPEAKE HEALTH SYSTMS  
UPPER CHESAPEAKE HEALTH SYSTMS  
Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION**

STACEY A JENKINS

SSN #

**Claimant**

vs.

UPPER CHESAPEAKE HEALTH SYSTM  
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: 1215963

Appellant: Claimant

Local Office : 63 / CUMBERLAND  
CLAIM CENTER

July 09, 2012

**For the Claimant: PRESENT**

**For the Employer: PRESENT, HERMAN JACKSON, CHRISTOPHER RICCI**

**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, Stacey Jenkins, began working for Upper Chesapeake Health Systems INC on or about June 14, 2010. At the time of separation, the claimant was working full-time as an environmental services aide, making \$10.20 an hour. The claimant last worked for the employer on or about February 14, 2012, before resigning.

The claimant had numerous complaints about her working conditions in the last six months of employment. She was hurt on the job when a linen cart rolled back on her, partially because of the inaction of a male co-worker. The claimant was angry about the incident and believed that she was injured because of gender prejudices held by her co-worker. She was later required to work with him again, to her distress.

On January 31, 2012, the claimant was denied leave when her cat was dying. While the employer eventually reversed itself, and provided her with paid leave, the matter further frayed the relationship between the claimant and the employer.

Finally, the claimant agreed to change shifts in the last month or so of her employment. She was assured that scheduling would not otherwise change. The claimant discovered that of 26 employees, she was the only one to be required to work consecutive weekends. She complained to Herman Jackson of human resources, but the parties could not agree on a resolution. The claimant quit 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 credible testimony and evidence established that the claimant had numerous complaints about the employer in the last six months of employment. The employer failed to insulate her from working with the co-worker who was involved in her accident of October 23, 2011. Further, they initially denied her request for leave in January, when her cat was dying. Finally, the claimant approached the employer with her complaints, as required and expected, in the last month regarding a scheduling dispute, yet she was rebuffed. The claimant quit for valid circumstances.

## 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 February 12, 2012, and for the (9) nine 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 modified.



W. Rosselli, 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 24, 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 26, 2012

BLP/Specialist ID: WCU3T

Seq No: 001

Copies mailed on July 09, 2012 to:

STACEY A. JENKINS  
UPPER CHESAPEAKE HEALTH SYSTEMS  
LOCAL OFFICE #63