**STATE OF FLORIDA**
**REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION**

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellant

R.A.A.C. Order No. 13-04993

vs.

Referee Decision No. 13-42165U

Employer/Appellee

---

**ORDER OF REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION**

---

This case comes before the Commission for disposition of the claimant's appeal pursuant to Section 443.151(4)(c), Florida Statutes, of a referee's decision wherein the claimant was held disqualified from receipt of benefits and the employer's account was noncharged.

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.

The issue before the Commission is whether the claimant was discharged by the employer for misconduct connected with work as provided in Section 443.101(1), Florida Statutes.

The referee made the following findings of fact:

> The claimant was employed as a customer service representative with [the employer] from August 8, 2011 through March 5, 2013. The claimant was counseled for aggressive and unprofessional behavior in July and August 2012. The claimant was involved in two loud and disruptive conversations with his immediate supervisors. The claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence from August 1, 2012 through December 1, 2012. The claimant reported to the employer that he needed time off work to deal with his bipolar diagnosis. When the claimant returned to work he provided the employer [a] doctor's note stating that not working a set-schedule [exacerbated] his bipolar disorder. The

> claimant was never given a set-schedule by the employer. The claimant told the employer that he had not been given proper training and was re-enrolled in the eight week training class for new hires when he returned from his leave of absence. On March 5, 2013 the claimant was engaged in a customer call when he was overheard by a team leader. The team leader heard the claimant talking to the customer in a loud and disrespectful way. The team leader told the claimant that he needed to calm down and waited for the claimant to do so. The claimant did not calm down or change his tone of voice, the team leader left and reported the incident to her supervisor. The claimant was questioned about the incident and reported to the employer that he had called the customer a dumbass during the call. The claimant then proceeded to call one of the supervisors a dumbass. The claimant was discharged by the employer.

Based on these findings, the referee held the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work. Upon review of the record and the arguments on appeal, the Commission concludes the referee's decision is not supported by competent and substantial evidence and, therefore, is not in accord with the law; accordingly, it is reversed.

Section 443.036(30), Florida Statutes, states that misconduct connected with work, "irrespective of whether the misconduct occurs at the workplace or during working hours, includes, but is not limited to, the following, which may not be construed in pari materia with each other":

> (a) Conduct demonstrating a conscious disregard of an employer's interests and found to be a deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expects of his or her employee.
>
> (b) Carelessness or negligence to a degree or recurrence that manifests culpability or wrongful intent, or shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to his or her employer.
>
> (c) Chronic absenteeism or tardiness in deliberate violation of a known policy of the employer or one or more unapproved absences following a written reprimand or warning relating to more than one unapproved absence.

> (d) A willful and deliberate violation of a standard or regulation of this state by an employee of an employer licensed or certified by this state, which violation would cause the employer to be sanctioned or have its license or certification suspended by this state.
>
> (e) A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:
> 1. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rule's requirements;
> 2. The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or
> 3. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.

When a worker has been discharged from employment, the employer bears the burden of proving the discharge was for misconduct connected with the work, as the term is defined by law. *See Lewis v. Unemployment Appeals Commission,* 498 So. 2d 608 (Fla. 5th DCA 1986). A review of the record reflects the employer's burden was not met in this case.

Although the employer's operations manager testified the employer has a zero-tolerance policy for unprofessionalism towards customers, the employer did not provide a professionalism or harassment policy for the hearing. The only policies contained in the record address security verification procedures. With respect to subparagraph (e), it is axiomatic that, in establishing the violation of a policy, the employer should provide a copy of the policy and enter it into the record at the hearing. *See* R.A.A.C. Orders No. 13-04349 (August 29, 2013), No. 12-01590 (May 3, 2012), No. 12-07116 (August 3, 2012), and No. 12-07696 (August 21, 2012), among others.

The claimant denied he was trained on customer service policies and asserted he was only trained on following a telephone script. Therefore, the record is insufficient to establish misconduct as the term is defined in subparagraph (e) of the statutory definition of misconduct.

In her written decision, the appeals referee cited subparagraphs (a) and (b) of Section 443.036(30), Florida Statutes, and concluded the claimant's actions amounted to misconduct connected with work within the meaning of the law. The Commission notes no allegations of carelessness or negligence were presented at the hearing; therefore, subparagraph (b) is inapplicable. Accordingly, it appears the referee concluded the claimant's actions amounted to misconduct under subparagraph (a) of the statutory definition of misconduct.

The record reflects the employer made the decision to discharge the claimant after concluding that his actions during a phone call that took place on March 5, 2013, amounted to customer abuse. In her conclusions of law, the referee recognized that conflicting evidence was presented by the parties. After analyzing the evidence, the referee resolved material evidentiary conflicts in favor of the employer. The employer presented the testimony of two witnesses who asserted the claimant was irate and confrontational during interactions with them that occurred in July and August of 2012. When questioned regarding what the claimant specifically said during those instances, the employer's first team leader failed to provide responsive testimony. She asserted the claimant was irate and confrontational and that his outbursts were not uncommon. Although the operations manager asserted the claimant was very loud, she also failed to provide testimony to establish how the claimant was abusive to his coworkers or herself. Finally, the Commission notes that the purported July and August 2012 incidents were not temporally proximate to the time of the claimant's discharge. *See Panama City Housing Authority v. Sowby*, 587 So. 2d 494, 498 (Fla. 1st DCA 1991) (highlighting that "the statute requires a nexus between the alleged misconduct and the termination of employment, if a discharged employee is to be disqualified from receipt of . . . benefits"); *see also*, *Gentsch, Larsen, Traad v. Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security*, 390 So. 2d 802 (Fla. 3d DCA 1980).

It is undisputed that, after the August incident, the claimant took a lengthy medical leave of absence until December 2012, in order to receive treatment for bipolar disorder. After his leave of absence, the claimant took part in an eight-week training period. The employer's operations manager acknowledged she was aware of the claimant's condition. The claimant testified that the employer's human resources department approved his medical leave of absence after he provided a note from his doctor which relayed that the workplace conditions were contributing to his levels of stress and resulting in bipolar episodes. The claimant testified that, as an individual with bipolar disorder, it was very important that he work structured hours. He presented unrebutted testimony that he provided the employer with two forms from his doctor requesting a set work schedule. The claimant explained that, without a regular work schedule, he can be easily irritated and the requests were made in order to help him be a more productive member of the employer's staff. The claimant asserted that his schedule changed weekly. He attributed any inconsistencies in his behavior to his medical condition and the fact that the employer ignored his requests for an accommodation which would have helped him deal with his condition. He further asserted that he felt as if the employer was setting him up to fail.

Although the employer's operations manager emphasized the fact that the claimant did not take any calls during his training period, she acknowledged she had no write ups addressing behavioral issues during the claimant's 2013 eight-week training period, when the claimant was assigned a set schedule.

The employer's [second team leader] presented testimony regarding her personal observations of the claimant during the March 5, 2013 telephone call. She testified she observed the claimant being loud with a customer and asked him to calm down. She then observed the claimant for a few more minutes and when he continued to yell, she notified the senior operations manager. The employer's witnesses testified they reviewed an audio recording of the call-in question. The employer's first team leader and the employer's operations manager discussed the matter with the claimant during his termination meeting. They testified the claimant "said the customer was a dumbass" and that during the course of the termination meeting, he also called the senior operations manager a "dumbass." The employer's operations manager also testified the employer did not provide the claimant with the opportunity to hear the recording because the claimant became aggressive during the termination.

The operations manager testified that audio recordings contain proprietary information and are deleted after 30 days unless a request to save the file is made. The employer's second operations manager also testified, however, that a transcription of the recording is made. The Commission notes the employer did not provide a transcript of the call-in question for the hearing.

Although the claimant recalled the second team leader walking by, he testified he did not hear her issue him any instructions. He further testified that the customer on the call was irate because the claimant would not issue a refund and that he could not do so because the employer's policy did not permit him to. The claimant denied calling the customer a dumbass. He could not recall the events that occurred during the termination meeting. He explained he was very upset because the senior operations manager would not permit him to have a copy of his file, and removed himself from the meeting because he was becoming emotional.

Construing the evidence in the light most favorable to the employer, the party the referee deemed to be more credible, the record in this case contains insufficient evidence to establish misconduct as the term is defined in reemployment assistance law. The Commission notes disqualification from benefits under subparagraph (a) of Section 443.036(30), Florida Statutes, is appropriate only if a claimant's actions are in *conscious* disregard of an employer's interests and found to be a *deliberate* violation or disregard of reasonable standards of behavior the employer expects of his or her employee. The employer in this case had full knowledge of the claimant's

diagnosed medical condition and had even approved leave for the claimant to address his condition. The employer's witnesses did not rebut the claimant's testimony that he provided the employer with medical documentation requesting a reasonable accommodation to assist him in controlling his inconsistent behavior, which was the result of his medical condition. The referee found that the claimant was never given a set schedule by the employer.

Ordinarily, the behavior of the claimant in this case would clearly constitute disqualifying misconduct under subparagraph (a). In determining whether this particular claimant engaged in "conscious disregard" or a "deliberate violation," however, the Commission must review the facts in the light of claimant's medically verified diagnosis of bipolar disorder. Bipolar disorder is a long-accepted psychiatric condition that has been defined in the DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS (5th Ed. 2013) ("DSM–V") of the American Psychiatric Association, as well as its predecessor editions for many years. According to the DSM–V, diagnostic criteria for the manic and hypomanic episodes for Bipolar I Disorder[1] include a "distinct period of abnormally and persistently elevated, expansive or irritable mood." The mood disturbance must be sufficient to be noticeable by others, and in the case of manic episodes, the disturbance is severe enough to cause "marked impairment in social or occupational functioning." Claimant's attribution of his behavioral variations to his psychiatric condition, while not a medical opinion, is consistent with recognized symptoms of classic bipolar disorder. Furthermore, both his bipolar disorder, and the desirability of a set schedule to accommodate it, were verified by his treating practitioner(s).

When claimant raised his bipolar condition as an explanation for his behavior at the hearing, the employer's operations manager countered that his condition did not excuse his behavior. The Commission notes, as a general principle, that under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") an individual with a mental or emotional disability[2] can be held to the same standards of behavior reasonably required of his or her peers. *Palmer v. Circuit Court of Cook County, Ill.*, 117 F.3d 351, 352-53 (7th Cir. 1997); *Darcangelo v. Verizon Md., Inc.*, 189 Fed. Appx. 217, 218 (4th Cir. 2006); *but see Gambini v. Total Renal Care, Inc.*, 486 F.3d 1087, 1093 (9th Cir. 2007) ("conduct resulting from a disability is considered part of the disability,

---

[1] The evidence in this case did not specify whether claimant had been diagnosed with "classic" Bipolar I Disorder, Bipolar II Disorder, or one of the other related conditions such as cyclothymic disorder or substance or medication-related bipolar disorder. Because each of the diagnoses requires at least some clinically significant mood disturbances, the specific diagnosis is not determinative in this case.

[2] Bipolar disorder has generally been considered as a "disability" within the meaning of the ADA at least in cases where it is sufficiently severe to affect major life activities such as working or interacting with others. *See*, *e.g.*, *Den Hartog v. Wasatch Academy*,129 F.3d 1076, 1081 (10th Cir. 1997) and authorities cited therein.

rather than a separate basis for termination"). We also note, however, that if the claimant's request for a set schedule was a reasonable accommodation which the employer failed to provide, absent undue hardship, this principle would not be applicable. *See Tobin v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co.*, 553 F.3d 121 (1st Cir. 2009) (employer liable for failure to accommodate even where its discharge of plaintiff for failure to meet expectations was not pretextual, where accommodation might have permitted employee to achieve performance expectations); *Humphrey v. Memorial Hospitals Ass'n.*, 239 F.3d 1128, 1139-40 (9th Cir. 2001) ("the consequence of a failure to accommodate is . . . frequently an unlawful termination").

Regardless of whether or to what extent claimant was protected under the Americans with Disabilities Act, his condition must be considered in determining the sufficiency of the evidence to establish misconduct under subparagraph (a). We conclude that the referee erred in failing to take into account the claimant's medically verified psychiatric condition which the employer, whether or not it was required to do so, did not accommodate by providing a set schedule. Under the specific facts of this case, we conclude there was insufficient competent and substantial evidence to conclude that the claimant possessed the deliberateness or disregard necessary to establish misconduct under subparagraph (a). The Commission, therefore, concludes the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct connected with work and he is not disqualified from the receipt of benefits.

The decision of the appeals referee is reversed. The claimant is not disqualified from receipt of benefits as a result of this separation. The employer's tax account shall be charged with its pro rata share of benefits paid in connection with this claim.

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 10/25/2013, 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: Kimberley Pena
Deputy Clerk

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Reemployment Assistance Appeals
Suite 240
215 Market Street
Jacksonville FL 32202-2850

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 asisté ou gratis, nou gendwa rélé 1-800-204-2418. Sil vou plè pa pràn àmpil tàn, paské tàn limité pou ou ranpli apèl la. |

Docket No. **2013-42165U** Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

**CLAIMANT/Appellant** **EMPLOYER/Appellee**

APPEARANCES: CLAIMANT & EMPLOYER LOCAL OFFICE #: 3620-0

# 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.

CHARGES TO EMPLOYMENT RECORD: Whether benefit payments made to the claimant shall be charged to the employment record of the employer, pursuant to Sections 443.101(9); 443.131(3)(a), Florida Statutes; Rules 73B-10.026, 11.018, Florida Administrative Code. (If employer charges are not at issue on the current claim, the hearing may determine charges on a subsequent claim.)

**Findings of Fact:** The claimant was employed as a customer service representative with from August 8, 2011 through March 5, 2013. The claimant was counseled for aggressive and unprofessional behavior in July and August 2012. The claimant was involved in two loud and disruptive conversations with his immediate supervisors. The claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence from August 1, 2012 through December 1, 2012. The claimant reported to the employer that he needed time off work to deal with his bi-polar diagnosis. When the claimant returned to work he provided the employer doctor's note stating that not working a set-schedule exasperated his bi-polar disorder. The claimant was never given a set-schedule by the employer. The claimant told the employer that he had not been given

proper training and was re-enrolled in the eight week training class for new hires when he returned from his leave of absence. On March 5, 2013, the claimant was engaged in a customer call when he was overheard by a team leader. The team leader heard the claimant talking to the customer in a loud and disrespectful way. The team leader told the claimant that he needed to calm down and waited for the claimant to do so. The claimant did not calm down or change his tone of voice, the team leader left and reported the incident to her supervisor. The claimant was questioned about the incident and reported to the employer that he had called the customer a dumbass during the call. The claimant then proceeded to call one of the supervisors a dumbass. The claimant was discharged by the employer.

**Conclusions of Law:** The Unemployment Compensation Law of Florida defines misconduct connected with work as, but is not limited to, the following, which may not be construed in pari materia with each other:

(a) Conduct demonstrating conscious disregard of an employer's interests and found to be a deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expects of his or her employee.

(b) Carelessness or negligence to a degree or recurrence that manifests culpability, or wrongful intent, or shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interest or of the employee's duties and obligations to his or her employer.

(c) Chronic absenteeism or tardiness in deliberate violation of a known policy of the employer or one or more unapproved absences following a written reprimand or warning relating to more than one unapproved absence.

(d) A willful and deliberate violation of a standard or regulation of this state by an employee of an employer licensed or certified by this state, which violation would cause the employer to be sanctioned or have its license or certification suspended by this state.

(e) A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:

1. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rules requirements;
2. The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or
3. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.

The law provides that a claimant who was discharged for misconduct connected with work will be disqualified for benefits. "Misconduct", irrespective of whether the misconduct occurs at the workplace or during working hours, includes, but is not limited to, the following, conduct demonstrating conscious disregard of an employer's interest and found to be deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expects of his or her employee, or carelessness or negligence to a degree or recurrence that manifests culpability, wrongful intent, or shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interest or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer.

In cases of discharge, the burden is on the employer to establish that the discharge was for misconduct connected with work. At the hearing, the referee was presented with conflicting testimony regarding instances of unprofessional conduct that occurred in July and August 2012, training on professionalism the claimant received and the final incident that occurred on March 5, 2013. The referee alone is charged with resolving these conflicts. The appeals referee considered the factors set forth by the Unemployment Appeals Commission in Order No. 03-10946. Based on consideration of these factors, the referee accepts the testimony of the employer's witnesses to be more credible. Therefore, material conflicts in the evidence are resolved in favor of the employer. The claimant's actions in calling the customer a dumbass and refusing to calm down when told to be so by a team leader were insubordinate and as such disqualify him from receipt of benefits under Florida Statute Section 443.036(30).

# **Decision:** The determination dated May 7, 2013, is affirmed.

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 June 5, 2013.

D. DUNCAN
Appeals Referee

By: C E DeMoranville
C. E. DE MORANVILLE, 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 definitif sòf si ou depoze yon apèl nan yon delè 20 jou apre dat nou poste sa a ba ou. Si 20$^{vèm}$ 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 lamen, 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.