

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

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellee

R.A.A.C. Docket No. 20-00756

vs.

Referee Decision No. 0037343827-04U

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 and charged the employer's account.

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. The Commission's review is generally limited to the evidence and issues before the referee and 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 hired on September 18, 2017, and was separated on February 11, 2020. The [employer] is an employee leasing company and they leased the claimant to a [client]. The employer delegated the power to hire and to fire to the client. The claimant performed services for the client as a full-time Call Center Agent/Dispatcher. He had started working for the client as a temporary employee during March 2017. The claimant had been provided with the employee handbook. It contained the Code of Conduct and the employer's progressive disciplinary process. The claimant underwent training in how to do his job, including interacting with callers, rude and otherwise. The claimant was written up on October 18, 2018, for being rude to a patron of the

client's business. He was suspended for one week without pay. He initialed the document but did not offer any remarks on his behalf. Fourteen months later, on December 12, 2019, he was written up again for rudeness. This write-up, like the earlier one, was listed as Offences Number One. Like the earlier one, it contained a warning that future infractions may result in discipline. He initialed this one and did not offer any remarks on his behalf. On February 5, 2020, the claimant was provoked by a caller and lost control of himself during the call. He became angry with the caller, yelled at her, and was rude to her. His Supervisor came over to him and took control of the situation. He completed his workweek. On February 11, 2020, he was told that he was being discharged due to the call on the 5th.

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 supported by competent, substantial evidence nor is it in accord with the law; accordingly, it is reversed.

Workers who are discharged for misconduct connected with work are disqualified from receiving reemployment assistance benefits. §443.101(1)(a), Fla. Stat. As relevant here, misconduct is statutorily defined as:

(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.

\*\*\*

(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.

§443.036(29), Fla. Stat.

The courts and the Commission have held that the presence of sufficient provocation can excuse a claimant's misconduct, such as using profanity or fighting in the workplace. *See, e.g., Jackson v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 730 So. 2d 719, 712 (Fla. 5th DCA 1999) (and cases cited therein). The rationale is that, upon sufficient provocation, the claimant's behavior stems from an emotional, "heat-of-the-moment" reaction, and thus lacks the mental culpability required under subparagraph (a). *See, e.g., Anderson v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 517 So. 2d 754, 756 (Fla. 2d DCA 1987); *Davis v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 472 So. 2d 800 (Fla. 3d DCA 1985). While subparagraph (e)1. does not contain an express level of mental culpability like subparagraph (a), the subparagraph (e)1. definition has affirmative defenses, and the Commission has considered the presence of provocation in determining the applicability of the provision's "not-fairly-enforced" defense. R.A.A.C. Order No. 13-05983 (December 2, 2013).<sup>1</sup>

Here, the employer discharged the claimant for being rude to a customer after prior warnings. The employer's policy states to deal with angry/irate callers the employee should:

- Stay calm, remain courteous and do not become involved in the customer's emotions.
- Listen carefully and propose a solution.
- Don't interrupt – allow angry caller to express themselves.
- **Do NOT take anything they say personally!**
- If a caller is using profanity use this handy phrase: "If you continue to use profanity I will terminate the call."

(Emphasis in original.)<sup>2</sup>

The referee concluded that the claimant's actions did not amount to misconduct as defined under subparagraph (e)1. on the ground the claimant did not "intentionally and deliberately" violate the employer's policy. The referee further concluded subparagraph (a) misconduct was not established because the claimant was provoked by the customer.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at [http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac\\_finalorders/13-05983.pdf](http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac_finalorders/13-05983.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Although the employer's policy on how to deal with customers was submitted as evidence at the hearing below, the referee omitted to formally admit and mark the document into evidence as an exhibit. We admit the document(s) and direct the Commission Clerk to mark the document into evidence as R.A.A.C. Exhibit No. 1.

First, the Commission has held that a plain reading of the statute shows that an employer need not establish an *intentional* or *deliberate* rule violation under subparagraph (e)1. See R.A.A.C. 14-06636 at pg. 8 (June 1, 2015).<sup>3</sup> In this case, the employer established the claimant violated its rule when the claimant yelled at, interrupted, and was rude to a customer, telling her among other things to, “Stop giving me negative feedback!” and “You’re pushing my buttons!” apparently taking the caller’s frustration with him personally. Thus, whether the claimant is disqualified due to misconduct, under either subparagraph (e)1. or (a), turns on the applicability of the provocation defense — that is, whether sufficient provocation existed to diminish the claimant’s mental culpability under subparagraph (a) or whether the employer’s policy was not fairly enforced under subparagraph (e) due to the presence of the provocation.

The provocation defense is not unlimited and does not justify all reaction to provoking behavior. Several circumstances may remove one from the protection of the defense. For example, the provocation defense assumes that the claimant was initially provoked and did not herself engage in provocative or escalating behavior triggering the incident. Further, the provocation defense only excuses proportionate reaction – it does not protect a claimant from the consequences of disproportionate reaction or further escalation after the start of the incident.<sup>4</sup> And in some cases, such as this one, an employee accepts a job in which dealing with customers who may be upset is a known challenge of the job, and a degree of patience and restraint beyond normal may reasonably be expected of the employee.<sup>5</sup>

While the referee found the claimant was provoked, the decision is devoid of any subsidiary findings regarding what the customer did to provoke the claimant or any analysis as to whether this was *sufficient* to excuse the claimant’s conduct. However, even analyzing the evidence in light most favorable to the claimant, the customer’s actions in this case fall short of provocation sufficient to excuse misconduct.

For instance, the referee relied on *Anderson v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 517 So. 2d 754 (Fla. 2d DCA 1987). In that case, a coworker struck the claimant during an argument with a piece of wood, and the claimant cut the coworker with a knife. The court found the coworker initiated the altercation and the claimant striking a retaliatory blow did not amount to misconduct. Other similar cases also showed more egregious provocation than that demonstrated in

---

<sup>3</sup> Available at [http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac\\_finalorders/14-06636.pdf](http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac_finalorders/14-06636.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> For example, in R.A.A.C. Order No. 16-00046 (February 19, 2016), *per curiam affirmed sub nom Mercado v. 2K Clevelander LLC*, 207 So. 3d 240 (Fla. 3d DCA 2016), the Commission affirmed without comment a referee’s decision rejecting the provocation defense where a bar security employee knocked an inebriated customer to the floor in self-defense but then kicked him multiple times while he was down.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

this case. *General Asphalt Co., Inc. v. Harris*, 563 So. 2d 803 (Fla. 3d DCA 1990) (claimant struck a coworker with a shovel after the coworker threw hot asphalt pebbles at him); *Davis v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 472 So. 2d 800 (Fla. 3d DCA 1985) (a claimant lunged at a coworker who stuck her finger in the claimant's face, told her to mind her own business, and slapped her).

By contrast, in this case, a customer merely raised her voice out of frustration when communicating with the claimant. The customer was a patient's wife, who called and asked the claimant to patch her through to the doctor's office. The claimant told her they could take a message and send it but that he was unable to patch her through to the office. He also said he needed to get information in a certain order before he could take the message. The caller interrupted him; raised her voice, saying "you are not listening to me"; and asked him to please stop. She did not want to leave a message. This is when the claimant deviated from the employer's policy. He talked over the caller and stated, "All I can do is take a message. You have to listen to me! All I can do is take a message! It's all I can do!" He then asked in a raised voice whether she wanted him to take a message or not. The caller later stated she did not want to talk to him anymore and that she hoped he recorded the conversation. The claimant replied, "I really want you to stop giving me negative feedback, lady! Stop it!" He then said he was going to help her out by patching her to his supervisor. The caller replied, "No, you're not. You're just . . . ." The claimant spoke over her telling her to stop it and stated, "you're pushing my buttons."

While the caller in this case did raise her voice and interrupt the claimant, she neither threatened nor harassed the claimant as did other instigators in the above-cited cases. The claimant's reaction was out of proportion to the caller's statements. Further, the claimant did not follow the employer's policy on how to deal with angry and irate callers. He also received two prior warnings for similar incidents. Consequently, the claimant's conduct amounted to misconduct as defined under subparagraphs (a) and (e)1., and cannot be excused on provocation grounds.

The decision of the appeals referee is reversed. The claimant is disqualified from receipt of benefits for the week ending February 15, 2020, the five succeeding weeks, and until he becomes reemployed and earns \$4,675. The employer's account is relieved of charges in connection with this claim. As a result of this order, any benefits received by the claimant to which the claimant is not entitled may be considered an overpayment subject to recovery, with the specific amount of any overpayment to be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination, which may then be appealed.

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  
7/31/2020,  
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: Benjamin Bonnell  
Deputy Clerk



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



\*108728475 \*

---

---

**Docket No.0037 3438 27-04**

Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

---

***CLAIMANT/Appellee***

***EMPLOYER/Appellant***

---

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.

**CHARGES TO EMPLOYER'S EMPLOYMENT RECORD:** Whether benefit payments made to the claimant will 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 charges are not at issue on the current claim, the hearing may determine charges on a subsequent claim.)

**Findings of Fact:** The claimant was hired on September 18, 2017, and was separated on February 11, 2020. The employer, \_\_\_\_\_, is an employee leasing company and they leased the claimant to a client, \_\_\_\_\_. The employer delegated the power to hire and to fire to the client. The claimant performed services for the client as a full-time Call Center Agent/Dispatcher. He had started working for the client as a temporary employee during March 2017. The claimant had been provided with the employee handbook. It contained the Code of Conduct and the employer's progressive disciplinary process. The claimant underwent training in how to do his job, including interacting with callers, rude and otherwise. The claimant was written up on October 18, 2018, for being rude to a patron of the client's business. He was suspended for one week without pay. He initialed the document but did not offer any remarks on his behalf. Fourteen months later, on December 12, 2019, he was written up again for rudeness. This write-up, like the earlier one, was listed as Offences Number One. Like the earlier one, it contained a warning that future infractions may result in discipline. He initialed this one and did not offer any remarks on his behalf. On February 5, 2020, the claimant was provoked by a caller and lost control of himself during the call. He became angry with the caller, yelled at her, and was rude to her. His Supervisor came over to him and took control of the situation. He completed his workweek. On February 11, 2020, he was told that he was being discharged due to the call on the 5th.

**Conclusions of Law:** 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, willful 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
- d. unapproved absences following a written reprimand or warning relating to more than one unapproved absence.
- e. 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.
- f. 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.

The record reflects that the employer was the moving party in the separation. Therefore, the claimant is considered to have been discharged. The burden of proving misconduct is on the employer. *Lewis v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 498 So.2d 608 (Fla. 5th DCA 1986). The proof must be by a preponderance of competent substantial evidence. *De Groot v. Sheffield*, 95 So.2d 912 (Fla. 1957); *Tallahassee Housing Authority v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 483 So.2d 413 (Fla. 1986).

The record and evidence in this case establish that the claimant was discharged for allegedly violating a company policy. In order to show misconduct under section (e) Florida Statute §443.036(30) the employer must prove that they have a policy and that the claimant violated the policy. If the employer meets that burden then the claimant is disqualified from benefits unless the claimant can show that he was not aware of the policy, the policy is not lawful or related to the job, or the rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.

The employer established that they had the policy. They did not establish that the claimant had intentionally and deliberately violated it. Where no evidence was presented indicating that the claimant's incompetent performance was the result of a lack of effort, any wrongful intent, a deliberate disregard of workplace rules, or an indifference to the employer's interests, unsatisfactory job performance does not disqualify him from receipt of unemployment compensation benefits. *Pereira v. Unemployment Appeals Comm'n*, 745 So.2d 573 (Fla. 5thDCA 1999). Nor was it shown that he had a continuing history of this sort of conduct. Their own evidence reveals one incident in October 2018 and one incident in December 2019.

In addition, the recording of the phone call showed that the claimant was provoked. It has been held in analogous circumstances that striking a retaliatory blow rather than withdrawing from attack or provocation by an aggressor may show poor judgment and inability to control oneself which justifies dismissal, but does not constitute misconduct justifying denial of unemployment compensation benefits. *Anderson v. Florida Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 517 So.2d 754 (Fla. 2d DCA 1987). The claimant responded by striking a retaliatory verbal blow, rather than withdrawing from the provocation of the caller. His conduct did justify dismissal but did not rise to the level of misconduct.

As such, the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct under the above subparagraphs and is not disqualified for benefits.

The law provides that benefits will not be charged to the employment record of a contributing employer who furnishes required notice to the Department when the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with the work.

The record reflects that the claimant was not discharged for misconduct connected with work. Accordingly, it is held that the employer has not met the requirements of the law for the non-charging of benefits paid in connection with this claim.

The hearing officer was presented with conflicting testimony regarding material issues of fact and is charged with resolving these conflicts. The Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission set forth factors to be considered in resolving credibility questions. These 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.

**Decision:** The determination dated March 6, 2020, is Affirmed. The claimant is not disqualified for the period beginning from February 9, 2020, if otherwise eligible. Benefits paid will be charged to the employers account.

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 June 9, 2020.

**S. DIMON**  
Appeals Referee

By:



MONTY CROCKETT, 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 20<sup>th</sup> day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday defined in F.A.C. 73B-21.003(4), 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](https://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, 1211 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 300, Tallahassee, FL 32301-2975; (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 the last five digits of the 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.

There is no cost to have a case reviewed by the Commission, nor is a party required to be represented by an attorney or other representative to have a case reviewed. The Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission has not been fully integrated into the Department's CONNECT system. While correspondence can be mailed or faxed to the Commission, no correspondence can be submitted to the Commission via the CONNECT system. All parties to an appeal before the Commission must maintain a current mailing address with the Commission. A party who changes his/her mailing address in the CONNECT system must also provide the updated address to the Commission, in writing. All correspondence sent by the Commission, including its final order, will be mailed to the parties at their mailing address on record with the Commission.

**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 envío 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-21.003(4), 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](https://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, 1211 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 300, Tallahassee, FL 32301-2975; (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 los últimos cinco dígitos del 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.

No hay ningún costo para tener un caso revisado por la Comisión, ni es requerido que una parte sea representado por un abogado u otro representante para poder tener un caso revisado. La Comisión de Apelación de Asistencia de Reempleo no ha sido plenamente integrado en el sistema CONNECT del Departamento. Mientras que la correspondencia puede ser enviada por correo o por fax a la Comisión, ninguna correspondencia puede ser sometida a la Comisión a través del sistema CONNECT. Todas las partes en una apelación ante la Comisión deben mantener una dirección de correo actual con la Comisión. La parte que cambie su dirección de correo en el sistema CONNECT también debe proporcionar la dirección actualizada a la Comisión, por escrito. Toda la correspondencia enviada por la Comisión, incluida su orden final, será enviada a las partes en su dirección de correo en el registro con la Comisión.

**ENPÒTAN - DWA DAPÈL:** Desizyon sa a ap definitiv 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-21.003(4), 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 pèman 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](https://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, Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, 1211 Governors Square Boulevard, Suite 300, Tallahassee, FL 32301-2975; (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 mesajè lèt 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 senk dènye chif nimewo sekirite sosyal demandè a 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.

Pa gen okenn kou pou Komisyon an revize yon ka, ni ke yon pati dwe reprezante pa yon avoka oubyen lòt reprezantan pou ke la li a revize. Komisyon Apèl Asistans Reyanbochaj pa te entegre antyèman nan sistèm CONNECT Depatman an. Byenke korespondans kapab fakse oubyen pòste bay Komisyon an, okenn korespondans pa kapab soumèt bay Komisyon an atravè sistèm CONNECT. Tout pati ki nan yon apèl devan Komisyon an dwe mentni yon adrès postal ki ajou avèk Komisyon an. Yon pati ki chanje adrès postal li nan sistèm CONNECT la dwe bay Komisyon an adrès ki mete ajou a tou. Tout korespondans ke Komisyon an voye, sa enkli manda final li, pral pòste voye bay pati yo nan adrès postal yo genyen nan achiv Komisyon an.

---

An equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. All voice telephone numbers on this document may be reached by persons using TTY/TDD equipment via the Florida Relay Service at 711.