

# DECISION DIGEST

*Actual cases and rulings from Princeton Claims Management*

JANUARY 2024

## QUITTING DUE TO REASSIGNMENT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE “GOOD CAUSE”

### Background

A housekeeping aid worked for a hospital performing cleaning and sanitation duties for the facility. Due to performance issues, her employer changed the areas she was responsible for cleaning from three areas to five. It was understood that the time required to clean these five areas was equal to the time required for the prior three. The employee believed that she was being treated unfairly because of the reassignment and resigned from her position via a handwritten letter and without notice.

### Process

The employee filed a claim for UI (unemployment insurance) benefits after leaving her position due to her dissatisfaction with her new assignment. She claimed that the change in her duties constituted unfair treatment by her employer. Upon review, the DOL deputy determined that the employee did not have good cause to leave as there was no evidence that the new working conditions were severe enough to warrant ending her employment. Under the terms of her employment, there was no guarantee that the employee's areas to clean would not be changed as needed. The claimant appealed the determination.

The appellant claimant along with an interpreter, and the employer witness with PCM appeared before the Appeal Tribunal to adjudicate the matter. The claimant argued that she did have good cause for leaving due to her perception that the change in her duties was unfair. The employer countered that it was within the scope of their authority to change her assigned cleaning areas as needed.

### Judgment

In their decision, the Appeal Tribunal examiner opined that the employer was fully within their authority to change the employee's cleaning areas, as the employee was not promised that there would never be any change. Additionally, the change in cleaning areas was initiated by the employer in response to performance issues by the employee. The claimant's resignation was not due to a change in working conditions, nor a new offer of work, but rather because of a dissatisfaction with the change in the areas to which she was assigned cleaning duties. Since the claimant's reasons for her leaving did not constitute good cause for voluntarily leaving her job, she was held disqualified for benefits in accordance with N.J.S.A. 43:21-5(a).

***This decision confirms that the employer is within its authority to reassign an employee if it is within the scope of their responsibilities, and they were not guaranteed a permanent assignment. If an employee leaves due to their dissatisfactions caused by the change it does not establish good cause for leaving and is disqualifying under the NJ UI Law.***

For more information about Princeton Claims Management or unemployment insurance eligibility, please contact LuAnne Frascella at [lfrascella@njha.com](mailto:lfrascella@njha.com) or Kathleen Henry at [khenry@njha.com](mailto:khenry@njha.com).