

**NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY**

Interoffice Communication

Date: October 12, 2021

TO: Holders of Interpretation Manual, All Directors, Adjudicators and Appeals Referees

FROM: R. Glen Peterson, Chief Counsel

SUBJECT: DES Interpretation No. 273

Pursuant to 2011 N.C. Sess. Laws 401, the Employment Security Commission of North Carolina became the North Carolina Department of Commerce, Division of Employment Security ("DES") on November 1, 2011. Interpretations adopted prior to the amendments made by 2011 N.C. Sess. Laws 401 which were effective on that date continue to apply and should be construed as Interpretations of DES.

In accordance with DES Interpretation No. 252, the attached DES Interpretation No. 273 has been adopted as an official interpretation by the North Carolina Department of Commerce, Division of Employment Security. "Interpretations issued by the Chief Counsel on behalf of [DES] will continue to be considered as a written interpretation or legal opinion of [DES] and shall be continued to be considered as a precedent in all issues considered in the written interpretation." DES Interpretation No. 252. The attached material is relevant and suitable to be an interpretation of the Employment Security Law, and as such, it shall be distributed to all holders of interpretation manuals, all directors, all adjudicators, and all appeals referees. Also attached is a current index of DES's Interpretations.

Any questions about this Interpretation should be directed to the office of the Chief Counsel at (984) 236-5987.

**NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY**

**DES INTERPRETATION NO. 273**

**TO:** North Carolina Department of Commerce, Division of Employment Security

**FROM:** R. Glen Peterson, Chief Counsel

**SUBJECT:** Whether Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits will be paid when an employee refuses to comply with the employer's policy mandating employees to have received a COVID-19 vaccine

---

**Preliminary Considerations**

Each claim for unemployment insurance benefits is determined upon its own specific facts and in accordance with the Employment Security Law<sup>1</sup> and applicable case law. Disqualification from receiving benefits may occur for being discharged due to misconduct, such as when violating an employer's reasonable policy without cause, or for leaving work without good cause attributable to the employer.

Before prescribing a mandatory vaccination program for its employees, an employer should have a written policy, which has been made known to its employees. Some employers may have a need or business interest in requiring employees to receive a COVID-19 vaccination. During a public health emergency such as the COVID-19 pandemic, all employers may reasonably require their employees to receive vaccination (including any booster shots that may be recommended by public health authorities). The federal Equal Employment Opportunity laws do not prevent an employer from requiring its employees to be vaccinated for COVID-19, subject to the reasonable accommodation provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).<sup>2</sup>

Whether the individual was discharged or left work, preliminary considerations would include whether the employer's policy mandating COVID-19 vaccination contained medical and religious exemptions to receiving a vaccine. If the policy did not contain such exemptions and the individual's refusal to comply was for medical or religious reasons supported by appropriate documentation (such as a statement

---

<sup>1</sup> Chapter 96 of the North Carolina General Statutes.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Equal Emp't Opportunity Comm'n, What You Should Know About COVID-19 and the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act, and Other EEO Laws: Technical Assistance Questions and Answers K.1 (updated May 28, 2021).

from the individual's medical provider reflecting objections on medical grounds or, in the case of a refusal on religious grounds, a statement from the individual setting forth the sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance that gives grounds for refusal and/or a statement from a religious official describing the religious tenet that precludes taking the COVID-19 vaccine), the individual would not be disqualified from receiving benefits. Under these circumstances, misconduct would not have been shown for a discharge, and in the case of a leaving, the leaving would have been for good cause attributable to the employer. Without such documentation or other competent, convincing, and credible evidence, the claimant would be disqualified for benefits.

### Discharge

An individual who is unemployed due to misconduct connected with the work is disqualified for benefits.

Misconduct<sup>3</sup> connected with the work is either of the following:

- (1) Conduct evincing a willful or wanton disregard of the employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of an employee or has explained orally or in writing to an employee.
- (2) Conduct evincing carelessness or negligence of such degree or recurrence as to manifest an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer.

N. C. Gen. Stat. § 96-14.6(b).

North Carolina does not have any unemployment insurance case law dealing with discharge for refusal to comply with an employer's vaccination policy.<sup>4</sup> In the absence of controlling case law, North Carolina courts may examine cases from other states.

One such case was decided in South Carolina in the matter of *AnMED Health v. South Carolina Department of Employment and Workforce*, 404 S.C. 224, 743 S.E. 2d 854 (2013), which contains an analysis that is very similar to the one found in the North Carolina case of *In re Cantrell*, 44 N.C. App. 718, 263 S.E.2d 1 (1980) (which also

---

<sup>3</sup> N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-14.6(c) also contains examples of prima facie evidence of misconduct but this section will not be addressed in this memo. None of the examples are applicable.

<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the State does require certain vaccinations before a child can attend a school or childcare facility. N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 130A-152 through -158. In these cases, North Carolina permits medical and religious exemptions. See N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 130A-156 and 130A-157. But an administrative rule regarding those vaccinations specifically states, "[T]here is no exception to these requirements for the case of a personal belief or philosophy ... not founded upon a religious belief." See 10A NCAC 41A .0403.

deals with an employee's refusal of an employer request, but not of a vaccination). *Cantrell* holds that in deciding whether a claimant's refusal amounts to misconduct, you must consider the reasonableness of the employer's request in the light of all the circumstances, and the employee's reason for noncompliance. The employee's behavior is not "willful misconduct," if it was justifiable or reasonable under the circumstances. *In re Cantrell*, 44 N.C. App. at 720.

In the *AnMed Health* case, the employer required flu vaccination of employees, but its policy allowed exemptions if certain Centers for Disease Control guidelines were met. The claimant did not meet these guidelines, was not granted an exemption, and was discharged for refusing to comply with the employer's vaccination policy. The Court, however, determined that the claimant was discharged without cause and was not disqualified for benefits. The claimant had unique circumstances, supported by credible medical documentation, that showed that submitting to the immunization would jeopardize her health. The claimant had provided the documentation to the employer prior to discharge, but she had been discharged anyway.

An employer's requirement that its employees be COVID-19-vaccinated in order to continue in employment may be a reasonable request in the light of all circumstances, but if the claimant has refused to comply based on credible medical documentation that has been provided to the employer prior to discharge, the claimant's refusal may be justifiable or reasonable under the circumstances and does not amount to misconduct.

The *AnMed Health* case dealt with a medical justification, but this is not the only justifiable or reasonable basis for refusal.

If an employee were to present evidence supporting his or her opposition to receiving a vaccine on religious grounds, this also may serve as a justifiable or reasonable basis for refusal.

In reviewing a claimant's medical or religious documentation in support of his or her refusal to comply with the employer's vaccine mandate, it is important to determine whether the documentation is compelling or comes from a dependable source. The medical notation should come from a medical doctor or other credible medical practitioner who has experience with the claimant and his or her medical conditions and can relate how a vaccination would negatively impact one or more of those conditions. For religious exceptions, the claimant's refusal should be based on a sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance of the claimant, even if the employer is unfamiliar with such beliefs, practices, or observances. If there are "facts that provide an objective basis for questioning either the religious nature or the sincerity of a particular belief, practice, or observance, [it] would be justified [to request] additional supporting information."<sup>5</sup> This could, for example, take the form

---

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Equal Emp't Opportunity Comm'n, *supra* note 2, at K.12.

of “1. A signed statement from a religious official describing the religious tenet that precludes taking a vaccine and/or 2. A personally written statement describing the religious basis for [the claimant’s] objection to taking [the COVID-19 vaccine].”<sup>6</sup>

An employee who does not get vaccinated due to a medical disability (covered by the ADA) or a sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance (covered by Title VII) may be entitled to a reasonable accommodation that does not pose an undue hardship on the operation of the employer’s business.<sup>7</sup>

It should be noted that in the event a governmental mandate is imposed requiring vaccination, refusal could be considered misconduct under current case law. North Carolina case law has long upheld the authority of the government to require vaccinations. As stated in *State v. Hay*, 126 N.C. 999, 35 S.E. 459 (1900), where a defendant refused a smallpox vaccination ordered by the town of Burlington for all citizens pursuant to State law,

[T]he present rapid means of intercourse between most distant points would so spread the [smallpox] disease as to quickly paralyze commerce and all public business if the government could not at once stamp out the disease by compelling all alike, for the public good as much as for their own, to submit to vaccination.

*Hay*, 126 N.C. at 1001, 35 S.E. at 461. The *Hay* Court, while upholding the power of the State to order vaccinations, did recognize that there could be medical conditions where it would not be safe to submit to vaccination and that “would be a sufficient excuse for noncompliance[.]” *Hay*, 126 N.C. at 1003, 35 S.E. at 461.

In the unemployment insurance context, *In re Collingsworth*, 17 N.C. App. 340, 194 S.E.2d 210 (1973) recognized that failure to comply with a governmental safety mandate for which one is discharged would be considered misconduct (where an employee refused to wear ear protection devices mandated by the Occupational Safety and Health Act). A governmental employer will be treated as any other employer, however, for purposes of this Interpretation.

### **Leaving Work**

Pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-14.5(a), an individual who has left work for a reason other than good cause attributable to the employer is disqualified to receive unemployment benefits.<sup>8</sup> When an individual leaves work, the burden of showing

---

<sup>6</sup> See *Harris v. Univ. of Mass.*, Lowell, No. 21-CV-11244-DJC, 2021 WL 3848012, at \*4 (D. Mass. Aug. 27, 2021).

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Equal Emp’t Opportunity Comm’n, *supra* note 2, at K.2.

<sup>8</sup> N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-14.8 allows for leaving work due to military spouse relocation and domestic violence reasons, but they do not apply here.

good cause attributable to the employer rests on the individual and the burden may not be shifted to the employer.

There are many North Carolina unemployment insurance cases that deal with leaving work after refusing to follow an employer's directive, even though they do not involve vaccination refusals. They offer guidance in this area.

In many cases, an employee's decision to leave work instead of following an employer's directive results in their disqualification for benefits. *E.g., King v. North Carolina Department of Commerce*, 228 N.C. App. 61, 743 S.E.2d 83 (2013) (disqualifying claimant when he left work due to change in employer policy and could not prove he left due to good cause attributable to employer).

In some circumstances, employees have been able to meet their burden of showing good cause attributable to the employer, even though they had left work. For example, in *In re Clark*, the employee social worker voluntarily<sup>9</sup> left work after being instructed by her superiors to initiate custody proceedings to remove children from their parents' care in two cases. The social worker had previously promised the children's parents that she would not do so in accordance with her employer's policies and determined that initiating the proceeding would cause her to violate the ethical standards of her profession. Accordingly, she resigned. *In re Clark*, 47 N.C. App. 163, 167, 266 S.E.2d 854, 856 (1980). In that unique circumstance, which is unlikely to be present in the COVID-19 context, the employee was held to have shown good cause attributable to the employer.

In *Eason v. Gould, Inc.*, 66 N.C. App. 260, 311 S.E.2d 372 (1984), *aff'd*, 312 N.C. 618, 324 S.E.2d 223 (1985), an employee left work on March 10 after being told that she would be laid off as of March 19. The Court of Appeals held that the employee was voluntarily<sup>10</sup> unemployed between March 10 and March 19, but that she was eligible for benefits after March 19, at which point it was undisputed that the employee would have been laid off.

In reaching this conclusion, the Court had to determine whether the claimant had left work with good cause attributable to the employer and opined that "a good cause within the meaning of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-14(1) (1981) [now 96-14.5(a)] includes a reaction to requests or policies of the employer which would be considered valid by 'reasonable minds.'" *Eason*, 66 N.C. App. at 262, 311 S.E.2d at 374.

The result of these cases is that in a few limited and fact-specific circumstances, employees have been able to show that, though the employee left work, there was still good cause attributable to the employer for the separation. In the context of a COVID-19 vaccination policy, it is unclear whether such circumstances would exist.

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that the requirement that an employee must have left work "voluntarily" has been removed from the Employment Security Law. 1989 N.C. Sess. Laws 583 §§ 7, 8.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

As noted above, an employee who would be eligible for a medical or religious exemption who properly requested an accommodation and was not granted one might be able to show good cause attributable to the employer. In addition, it is at least possible that some other unique factual circumstances would cause reasonable minds to conclude that the employee's separation was nonetheless caused by actions attributable to the employer. See *Clark* and *Eason, supra*. Close attention should be paid to the facts of all cases to determine whether the employee has shown such good cause attributable to the employer.

In the event that a claimant is separated from employment due to his or her refusal to comply with the employer's vaccine mandate due to reasons other than medical or religious objections, the claimant must prove by cogent, credible, and convincing evidence that a reasonable mind would find such refusal valid and thus carry his burden of proving his leaving was due to good cause attributable to the employer. See *Eason, supra*. Many factors may be considered, including the proven efficacy of the vaccine in reducing transmission of COVID-19, the vaccine's prevention of serious outcomes from COVID-19, and the vaccine's safety among those vaccinated, in determining whether refusal to receive the vaccine as mandated "would be considered valid by [a] 'reasonable mind[ ].'" *Eason*, 66 N.C. App. at 262, 311 S.E.2d at 374.

It would be wise to recall the words of Justice Douglas from 1900 in *State v. Hay, supra*, when the state was dealing with another epidemic:

Compulsory vaccination is not an unreasonable requirement, as experience has shown that it is, in times of epidemic, necessary for the protection of the community, and equally so of the individual. It is ordinarily less harsh than quarantine or isolation, and in the great majority of cases has no injurious effect beyond some slight temporary illness. But there may be cases where vaccination, owing to certain exceptional conditions of health, may be dangerous, or even fatal."

*State v. Hay*, 126 N.C. at 1004, 35 S.E. at 462 (Douglas, J., concurring).

In conclusion, the Division will examine each individual's claim for benefits in accordance with applicable law and make the determination of whether he or she is qualified to receive UI benefits based on the facts and circumstances of each case.

Adopted as an official Interpretation by the North Carolina Department of Commerce, Division of Employment Security on October 12, 2021.

INTERPRETATIONS

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
3	Interpretation of Section 19(f)(6) of the law.
17	Labor unions coverage under the North Carolina Law.
18	Commission Records shall show true status of employing unit.
27	Determination of suitable work when physical disability is in question.
33	Liability under mandatory provision of Law supersedes voluntary election – Termination of Coverage- Section 8(b) and (c) and Section 19(f) of the Unemployment Compensation Law.
46	Endorsement of checks Intended for Unemployment Compensation Commission but sent to Commission of Revenue.
48	Unemployment Compensation Act; Interpretation of the phrase “Left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to employer,” as same appears in Section (5(a) of the Unemployment Compensation Laws of North Carolina
49	Unemployment Compensation Law; Effect of docketing judgment for contributions; Refunds.
55	Unemployment Compensation Tax; Compromise of tax involving claims in litigation.
69	Unemployment Compensation Law; Section 96-14(a) of the General Statutes; Voluntary or involuntary separation from work; Married woman who leave their work to follow their husbands to new residences.
79	Interpretation of Section 96-8(g)(1) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina since January 1, 2949 – Definition of Employment.
87	Employment Security Commission; Collection of contributions; Taxation; Docketing of summary judgment; Authority of Commission to accept chattel mortgages covering amount of contribution or taxes due; Statutes, directory and mandatory.
88	Interpretation of Section 96-11(c)(2) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Voluntary coverage.
92	Employment Security Commission; Proviso of Section 96-15(b); Double Affirmance Clause; Extent of payment of benefits under Double Affirmance Clause.

92-Supp-1	
98	Interpretation of General Statute of North Carolina 1-47- 10-year statute of limitation of collection on judgments.
101	Earnings reportable and availability of claimant serving on jury, National Guard, United States Army Reserve Corps, or as election official.
108	Interpretation of Section 96-8(g)(1) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina since January 1, 2949 – Definition “employment” – Whether home workers are in employment.
113	Interpretation of Section 96-9(b)(4)(A) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Use of Payrolls in Computing Contribution Rates on Re-established Liability After Computation Date.
114	Interpretation of Sections 96-8(g)(2), (3), (4) and (5) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Employment – Services performed within and without this State – Interstate employment.
118	Interpretation of Section 96-8(g)(7)(G) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Employment of mother and father by administratrix of son’s estate or by a partnership composed of sons.
119	Interpretation of Section 96-9(c)(4) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina of North Carolina – Total or partial transfer of experience rating account.
121	Employment Security Commission; Transfer of reserve accounts; Notice of Commission to successor employer; Refunds.
122	Priority of federal liens of personal property.
122-supp-1	Priority of federal liens.
124	Status of an individual who renders service as a preacher and in addition thereto works during the weekdays in covered employment and who becomes separated from his weekday employment.
131	Executors and administrators; Escheats; Disposition of unemployment compensation benefits where no administrator has qualified, and Section 28-68 does not apply.
139	Eligibility of individuals who are primarily self-employed and others who supplement regular earnings but are not engaged in self-employment.
144	Interpretation of Section 96-8(g)(7)(I) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Status of insurance agents,

- solicitors, and securities salesman under the Employment Security Law.
- 145 Officers of corporations – Employment – Employees
- 145- supp-a Officer’s salaries
- 146 Interpretation of Section 96-8(g)(1) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Status of bank directors required by statute to serve on committees.
- 153 Interpretation of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina, Section 96-8(6)(b) (formerly Section 96-9(c)(4(B)) Rate of Successor – Section 96-11(a) (No change) Effective date of liability.
- 158 Interpretation of Section 96-8(g)15 (formerly Section 96-8(g)(7)(O)) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina, defining “casual labor.”
- 163 Interpretation of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Section 96-12(b), Wages used in computing weekly benefit amount; Section 96-8(18), Base period. Section 96-8(10)(a), Total unemployment; Section 96-8(13), Wages – Effect of payment of wages retroactively for base period purposes and effect of such payments upon the eligibility of a claimant for benefits with respect to the week for which such retroactive wages were paid.
- 165 Interpretation of Section 96-10(d) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Liability of purchases or business for unpaid contributions of predecessor.
- 167 Supplement unemployment benefits.
- 168 Interpretation of Section 96-8(6) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Employment, Employer and Employee – On-the-job Training under the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the North Carolina Department of Education.
- 169 Interpretation of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Covered employment.
- 172 Interpretation – General Statutes Chapter 59 – Partnerships.
- 173 Interpretation – General Statutes Section 148-33.1 – Prisoners employed under work release plan – In employment.
- 174 Interpretation – Decision which has become final may be amended to correct clerical errors or to make the decision express the intent of the deputy.
- 177 Interpretation of Section 96-8(6) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Services performed under contract by one employment unit for another employing unit.

- 184 Interpretation of Section 96-8(6) g.7 of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Employment of stepson by stepfather.
- 187 Interpretation of Section 59-1 to 59-30 Inclusive – Limited partnerships.
- 190 Interpretation of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina Section 96-15(b)(1), Redetermination of an initial monetary determination.
- 205 Interpretation of Section 96-15(b)(2) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina and Section 1-593 and 103-4 of the General Statutes – Effect of legal holidays upon appeal period.
- 207 Interpretation of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina (1) Section 96-13(3), Commission – approved training, and (2) Section 96-18(f), Larceny and embezzlement.
- 220 Interpretation of Section 96-9(5) k., and 96-8(6) g.17 of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina - Orphanages.
- 221 Interpretation of Section 96-8(5)k, 96-8(5)a, and 96-8(6) g.17(iv) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Vocational workshop – Rehabilitation facility.
- 231 Interpretation of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Nonprofit organizations (1) Section 96-8(5)a, 96-8(5)k, and 96-11(c )(1) – Employer and (2) Section 96-9(d) – Method of financing
- 231- partial-revocation Partial Revocation of Interpretation of No. 231.
- 232 Interpretation of Section 96-8(5)k and 96-8(6) g.17(v) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Nonprofit organizations and exempt employment.
- 237 Interpretation of Section 96-11(c )(1) and 96-10(i) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Request by Employer X held liable under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for eight years that he be allowed to volunteer coverage under the Employment Security Law of North Carolina for all eight years in order to get tax credit beyond the five-year state of limitations.
- 239 Interpretation of Section 96-10(b)(1) of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Collection of contributions where employer does not protest or request a hearing within apt time.
- 248 International Longshoremen Association (ILA), Guaranteed Annual Income Plan (GAI) – South Atlantic Labor Contract.
- 251 Interpretation of Section 96-1(13) b of the Employment Security Law of North Carolina – Annuity plan.

252	Interpretations.
253	Total and partial unemployment.
254	Disclosure of information
255	Payments made to claimants
UIPL-3582	monies paid to members of the State National Guard or Air National Guard
255-suppl-1-v.1	Claims reporting of National Guard pay
255 – suppl – 1-v.2	National Guard and Reserve pay.
255-suppl-2	Vacation payments
256	Unemployment of part-time claimants.
256, Suppl. 1	Unemployment of part-time claimants.
257	Limited partnership agreements
258	Separation payments.
259	Voluntary contributions.
260	Referrals to the State Bureau of Investigation.
261	Leaves of absences; Revision of UI Procedural Letter 33(81).
262-suppl.-1-v.1	Bona fide permanent employment.
262-suppl.-1-v.2	Bona fide permanent employment.
263	Between terms denial for educational personnel.
263-suppl.-1	Between terms denial.
263-suppl.2	Public health nursing positions with schools.
263-suppl.-3	Between terms denial – Reasonable Assurances.
264	N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-8(10) – Applications of this Section in cases where an employer’s incentive pay plan results in an employee being paid for more hours than he actually worked.
264-suppl.-1	Attached unemployment, N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-8(10).
UIB-1187	Eligibility for attached unemployment.
265	Seasonal pursuits, N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-16.
266	Authority to reconsider State UI claim.
267	Disability pension offset requirements.

268	Extended benefits – Charging of benefits.
269	Who may appeal and/or protest an unemployment tax rate assignment, an Unemployment Tax Assessment and Demand for Payment, or an employer’s status and/or liability.
270	Job listings & fee charging – Temporary employment agencies.
270-suppl.-1	Temporary held/services agencies – Fee charging restriction.
271 v.1	Language proficiency requirement of job orders.
271-v.2	Raising separation from employment issues; Reduction in force plan – Separation determined by employer.
272	Application of the provision under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 96-14(1), Relating to separations due to disability or other health reasons.
273	Whether Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits will be paid when an employee refuses to comply with the employer’s policy mandating employees to have received a COVID-19 vaccine