STATE OF FLORIDA
REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellee

R.A.A.C. Order No. 15-00755

vs.

Referee Decision No. 0024641567-02U

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.

The issue before the Commission is whether the claimant voluntarily left work without good cause attributable to the employing unit or was discharged by the employer for misconduct connected with work within the meaning of Section 443.101(1), Florida Statutes.

The referee's findings of fact state as follows:

> The claimant worked for the employer from January 2012 through September 2, 2014, as a [full-time] resident assistant. On [September 2], 2014, the employer observed the claimant arrive to work and he was concerned about the claimant's appearance. The claimant had recently lost a lot of weight causing his face to sink in. This appearance, together with alleged confrontations with clients, alleged reports from others that the claimant was using drugs, and missing a mandatory meeting the prior day, the employer decided to require the claimant to take a drug test. The employer [had] two other people present when they asked the claimant to follow them into the bathroom at the women's center.

> There, the employer demanded a urine drug test. The claimant asked the employer why it was being requested, and the employer stated that it was to clear up some assumptions and statements by others that the claimant may be using drugs. The claimant asked who the people were who were saying that he was using drugs, but the employer did not provide the names. The claimant refused the test. The employer then asked for the claimant's badge and keys. The claimant handed them over and left the building.
>
> The employer has a policy stating that possession, distribution, sale, transfer, or use of alcohol or illegal drugs in the workplace, while on duty, or while operating employer-owned vehicles or equipment could lead to termination. The employer has a specific drug and alcohol use policy that states ["]while on [company] premises . . ., no employee may use, possess, distribute, sell, or be under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs.["] The employer also has a drug testing policy that states drug testing may be requested for the safety and health of the environment, and that refusal to submit to drug testing may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment.

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

At the hearing before the appeals referee, the claimant testified that he believed the employer discharged him when the employer asked for his badge and keys following his refusal to submit to a urinalysis test. The employer's witnesses, on the other hand, testified that the claimant walked out and abandoned his job after he refused to submit to the test. The referee resolved the conflicts in the evidence in favor of the claimant and concluded that the employer effectively discharged the claimant when the employer asked for his badge and keys.

Although not specifically analyzed by the referee, *LeDew v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 456 So. 2d 1219 (Fla. 1st DCA 1984) is applicable. In *LeDew*, 456 So. 2d at 1223-1224, the court, following case law under the National Labor Relations Act addressing constructive discharges, concluded that an employee who reasonably believed that he had been discharged by the employer must be so treated under the reemployment assistance law. The term "constructive discharge" is a legal fiction in which case the trier of fact is entitled to put substance over form and conclude that the employee was discharged under certain circumstances where there

is no actual, clearly articulated firing. In this case, the credited evidence reflects the claimant's belief that he had been discharged when the employer requested his badge and keys, following his refusal to submit to a urinalysis test, was reasonable. Consequently, the claimant's separation must be treated as a discharge for purposes of the reemployment assistance law.

While concluding that the claimant was effectively discharged, the referee did not analyze the claimant's behavior under the rubric of the statutory definition of misconduct. In her conclusions of law, the referee reasoned:

> In this case, the employer's witnesses both stated that the claimant was **not discharged** from their employment. The employer's witnesses [provided] a copy of their drug policy and testimony of both parties [confirmed] that the claimant did indeed refuse to take the drug test. However, the employer explicitly and consistently stated at [the] hearing that the claimant's refusal to take the drug test did not cause them to discharge him. The employer stated that, had the claimant remained at work or [shown] up to work the following day, the claimant would have had a job. Therefore, the violation of company policy did not lead to a discharge for misconduct. Without testimony from the employer proving their reason for discharge, the claimant's discharge was for reasons other than misconduct, and he is not disqualified for benefits.

The referee's analysis is an overly-technical approach inconsistent with the reemployment assistance statute in that it will allow benefits when the employer "constructively discharges" an employee, though not intending that exact outcome, even if the employee committed misconduct connected with work. *See* §443.101(1)(a), Fla. Stat. That the employer testified the claimant was not discharged does not preclude it from demonstrating the claimant's constructive discharge was for misconduct connected with work when the credited evidence itself reflects a causation between the two. *See generally Sienkiewicz v. Intrepid Powerboats, Inc.*, 774 So. 2d 739 (Fla. 2d DCA 2000) (the court noted that the claimant's own testimony can prove the discharge was for misconduct). The proper inquiry in cases where a discharge is deemed to have occurred under *LeDew*, is whether the employee's conduct, which precipitated the deemed discharge, constitutes misconduct connected with work. This cause-in-fact analysis not only leads to a more sensible resolution but is consistent with the reemployment assistance law. Section 443.101(1)(a), Florida Statutes, provides that "an individual shall be disqualified for benefits" when he or she "has been discharged by the employing unit for misconduct connected with his or her work." If the phrase

"discharged by the employing unit" is broad enough to permit a referee to conclude that a claimant was constructively discharged, it is broad enough to permit that constructive discharge to be examined to see if it was "for misconduct connected with his or her work." This reading of the statute is consistent with *LeDew* and similar cases: indeed, the court in the lead case cited in *LeDew* for the doctrine of constructive discharge, *NLRB v. Trumbull Asphalt Co.*, 327 F.2d 841, 845-46 (8th Cir. 1964), followed the same approach as the Commission today when, after determining that six employees were constructively discharged by the employer, it concluded that two of them should be denied relief because they had engaged in unlawful behavior under the National Labor Relations Act.

The Commission recognizes that some of its past orders have followed an analysis similar to that employed by the referee, and may have led the referee to the conclusion she reached in this case. For the reasons reflected herein, this order supersedes any prior Commission precedent which deviates from the analysis set forth above.

The credited evidence is clear that the claimant's refusal to take the urinalysis test caused the employer's request for his badge and keys, the event that constituted the constructive discharge. Thus, the remaining issue is whether the claimant's refusal to submit to a urinalysis test constituted misconduct connected with work. Section 443.036(29), 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. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, willful damage to an employer's property that results in damage of more than $50; or theft of employer property or property of a customer or invitee of the employer.
>
> (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) 1. A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:
>
> a. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rule's requirements;
>
> b. The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or
>
> c. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.
>
> 2. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, committing criminal assault or battery on another employee, or on a customer or invitee of the employer; or committing abuse or neglect of a patient, resident, disabled person, elderly person, or child in her or his professional care.

When an employer discharges an employee for refusing to submit to a urinalysis test, the operative issue is whether the employer utilized a reasonable suspicion standard as the basis for subjecting its employees to random drug testing. *See, e.g., Fowler v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 537 So. 2d 162 (Fla. 5th DCA 1989) (the claimant's refusal to submit to the test, requested upon the employer's reasonable suspicion, after the claimant was warned that failure to do so may result in dismissal, was sufficient to constitute misconduct under a predecessor version of Section 443.036(29)(a), Florida Statutes); *AAA Gold Coast Moving and Storage v. Weiss*, 654 So. 2d 281 (Fla. 4th DCA 1995) (the claimant's refusal did not constitute misconduct because the employer did not have a reasonable suspicion that the employee refusing the test had abused drugs). In order to satisfy the reasonable suspicion standard and vindicate the use of urinalysis testing, the official imposing the test must "point to specific objective facts and rational inferences that they are entitled to draw from these facts in light of their experience." *City of Palm Bay v. Bauman*, 475 So. 2d 1322, 1325-26 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985).

This employer presented sufficient evidence to establish a particularized, reasonable suspicion to request the claimant to submit to a urinalysis test. The employer's witness testified that, in a period of several months, the claimant's appearance had "radically changed," including rapid weight loss and "sinking" of his face. The employer's witness additionally testified that the claimant also began to miss mandatory meetings and was involved in confrontations with clients. Such change in appearance and behavior could be symptomatic of drug use. The employer also received reports from clients that he was using drugs. Based on these reports along with their own observations, the employer's witnesses requested the claimant to submit to a urinalysis test.

Moreover, the record reflects the claimant was aware of the employer's drug testing policy which provides that employees who refuse to submit to drug testing may be subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment. The employer has a statutorily recognized interest in maintaining a drug-free work environment (*see* §443.101(1)(d) & (11), Fla. Stat., holding illegal drug use to be misconduct), and can reasonably expect its employees to comply with its policies which are implemented to further such interest. In this case, the claimant's refusal to submit to a urinalysis test, which was requested based on the employer's reasonable suspicion, was a conscious disregard of the employer's interest and breached the reasonable standards of behavior the employer expects of its employees. Consequently, the Commission concludes the claimant's actions amounted to misconduct connected with work as that term is defined under Section 443.036(29)(a), Florida Statutes.

The decision of the appeals referee is reversed. The claimant is disqualified from receipt of benefits for the week ending September 6, 2014, the five succeeding weeks, and until he becomes reemployed and earns $3,395. As a result of this decision of the Commission, benefits received by the claimant for which the claimant is not entitled may be considered an overpayment subject to recovery, with the specific amount of the overpayment to be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination.

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 7/31/2015, 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: Mary Griffin
Deputy Clerk

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
PO BOX 5250
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32314 5250

*38530561 *

Docket No.0024 6415 67-02 Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

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

APPEARANCES Employer

Claimant

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), (13); 443.036(29), Florida Statutes; Rule 73B-11.020, Florida Administrative Code.

FINDINGS OF FACT: The claimant worked for the employer from January 2012 through September 2, 2014 as a fulltime resident assistant. On November 14, 2014, the employer observed the claimant arrive to work and he was concerned about the claimant's appearance. The claimant had recently lost a lot of weight causing his face to sink in. This appearance, together with alleged

confrontations with clients, alleged reports from others that the claimant was using drugs, and missing a mandatory meeting the prior day, the employer decided to require the claimant to take a drug test. The employer has two other people present when they asked the claimant to follow them into the bathroom at the women's center. There, the employer demanded a urine drug test. The claimant asked the employer why it was being requested, and the employer stated that it was to clear up some assumptions and statements by others that the claimant may be using drugs. The claimant asked who the people were who saying that he was using drugs, but the employer did not provide the names. The claimant refused the test. The employer then asked for the claimant's badge and keys. The claimant handed them over and left the building.

The employer has a policy stating that possession, distribution, sale, transfer, or use of alcohol or illegal drugs in the workplace, while on duty, or while operating employer-owned vehicles or equipment could lead to termination. The employer has a specific drug and alcohol use policy that states while on CFH premises …, no employee may use, possess, distribute, sell, or be under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs. The employer also has a drug testing policy that states drug testing may be requested for the safety and health of the environment, and that refusal to submit to drug testing may result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment.

CONCLUSION OF LAW: As of May 17, 2013, the Reemployment Assistance 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. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, wilful damage to an employer's property that results in damage of more than $50; theft of employer property or property of a customer or invitee of the employer.

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

a. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rule's requirements;

b The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or

c. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.

2. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, committing criminal assault or battery on another employee, or on a customer or invitee of the employer; or committing abuse or neglect of a patient, resident, disabled person, elderly person, or child in her or his professional care

* * * * *

When considering whether a separation is due to a quit or a discharge, consideration must be given as to the moving party in the separation. In this case, the claimant has stated he was discharged by the employer when he refused to take the drug test. This would be in accordance with the employer's policy, as presented at hearing, had the employer given this as testimony. However, at hearing, the employer's witnesses both testified that they **did not discharge** the claimant. Rather, their testimony was that the claimant refused to take the test, walked off the job, and never returned. In this scenario, the claimant has placed the burden of proof on the employer and the employer has placed the burden of proof on the claimant. Thus, the hearing officer was presented with conflicting testimony regarding material issues of fact and is charged with resolving these conflicts.

In Order Number 2003-10946 (December 9, 2003), the Commission set forth factors to be considered in resolving credibility questions. These factors 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. Therefore, the employer became the moving party in the separation when he asked for the claimant's badge and keys after the claimant refused to take the drug test. The presentation of the drug and alcohol policy and drug test policy at hearing lend credibility to the claimant's testimony that he was in fact discharged for his refusal.

The record reflects the claimant was discharged. When a claimant has been discharged from his employment, it is incumbent upon the employer to prove that he was discharged for misconduct connected with work before benefits can be denied. In order to do so, the employer must show by a preponderance of competent evidence that the claimant engaged in an act or course of conduct that violated his duties and obligation to the employer. Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services v. Unemployment Appeals Comm'n, 503 So. 2d 403 (Fla. 1st DCA 1987). In this case, the employer's witnesses both stated that the claimant was **not discharged** from their employment. They employer's witnesses did provide a copy of their drug policy and testimony of both parties confirm that the claimant did indeed refuse to take the drug test. However, the employer explicitly and consistently stated at hearing that the claimant's refusal to take the drug test did not cause them to discharge him. The employer stated that had the claimant remained at work or showed up to work the following day, the claimant would have had a job. Therefore, the violation of company policy did not lead to a discharge for misconduct. Without testimony from the employer proving their reason for discharge, the claimant's discharge was for reasons other than misconduct, and he is not disqualified for benefits.

As a side note, it is important to mention here that the employer based their accusation of drug use on reports by others who were not present at the hearing. When observing the changes in the claimant, the employer did not inquire as to whether the claimant had any health issues or ask if there was a reason for the changes. Rather, the employer asked for a drug test. According to their policy, the employer has the right to ask and it was proper. It is irrelevant in this case, however, because the employer did not discharge the claimant for violating the policy. Conversely, the claimant offered that the reason he was losing weight was because he rides a bicycle back and forth the work, sweats a lot, and he hadn't been eating. These three things were causing the weight loss. The claimant admitted to being a recovering addict and stated he would never touch drugs again.

The claimant also argued that his reason for refusing to take the drug test was because it was being administered by his employer. The claimant quoted Florida Statute 443.101(11) where it states that … "test results and chain of custody documentation provided to the employer by a licensed and approved drug-testing laboratory is self-authenticating and admissible in reemployment assistance hearings, and such evidence creates a rebuttable presumption that the individual used, or was using, controlled substances, subject to the following conditions: (b) Only laboratories licensed and approved as provided in s. 440.102(9), or as provided by equivalent or more stringent licensing requirements established by federal law or regulation, may perform the drug test." While the claimant's argument is correct as applied to a confirmed drug-test result and the qualification for the rebuttable presumption, it is irrelevant to the case at hand because no test was actually administered. This argument does provide a basis for the claimant's refusal to have it administered by the employer, but not for his lack of request for a licensed and approved drug-testing laboratory to administer it. This issue however is moot because the record reflects that the claimant was discharged, and the employer has provided no testimony that he was in fact discharged.

DECISION: The determination dated December 18, 2014, disqualifying the claimant, is REVERSED. The claimant is qualified for benefits for the week beginning August 31, 2014.

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 distributed/mailed to the last known address of each interested party on February 3, 2015.

CATHERINE ARPEN
Appeals Referee

By: Kristi Snyder

Kristi Snyder, 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 distribution/mailed 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 above 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 connect.myflorida.com or by writing to the address at the top of this decision. The date of the confirmation page will be the filing date of a request for reopening on the Department's 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 distribución/fecha de envìo 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 connect.myflorida.com o escribiendo a la dirección en la parte superior de esta decisión. La fecha de la página de confirmación será la fecha de presentación de una solicitud de reapertura en la página de Internet del Departamento.

Una parte que asistió a la audiencia y recibió una decisión adversa puede registrar una solicitud de revisión con la Comisión de Apelaciones de Servicios de Reempleo; 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 distribisyon/postaj. Si 20yèm 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, connect.myflorida.com oswa alekri nan adrès ki mansyone okomansman desizyon sa a. Dat cofimasyon page sa pral jou ou ranpli deman pou reouvewti dan web sit depatman.

Yon pati ki te asiste odyans la epi li resevwa yon desizyon negatif kapab soumèt yon demann pou revizyon retounen travay Asistans Komisyon Apèl la, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Faks: 850-488-2123); https://raaciap.floridajobs.org. Si poste a, dat tenm ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Si fakse, men yo-a delivre, lage pa sèvis mesaje lòt pase Etazini Sèvis nan Etazini Nimewo, oswa soumèt sou Entènèt la, dat yo te resevwa ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Pou evite reta, mete nimewo rejis la ak nimewo sosyal demandè a sekirite. Yon pati pou mande revizyon ta dwe presize nenpòt ak tout akizasyon nan erè ki gen rapò ak desizyon abit la, yo epi bay sipò reyèl ak / oswa legal pou defi sa yo. Alegasyon sou erè pa espesyalman tabli nan demann nan pou revizyon yo kapab konsidere yo egzante.
