

*This opinion will be unpublished and
may not be cited except as provided by
Minn. Stat. § 480A.08, subd. 3 (2018).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A20-0168**

Angela Tehranpour,
Relator,

vs.

Beauty Basics Inc.,
Respondent,

Department of Employment and Economic Development,
Respondent.

**Filed December 7, 2020
Affirmed
Ross, Judge**

Department of Employment and Economic Development
File No. 37666927-3

Angela Tehranpour, La Verne, California (pro se relator)

Beauty Basics Inc., Hammond, Louisiana (respondent employer)

Anne B. Froelich, Keri A. Phillips, Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic
Development, St. Paul, Minnesota (for respondent department)

Considered and decided by Bryan, Presiding Judge; Ross, Judge; and Bjorkman,
Judge.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

ROSS, Judge

Angela Tehranpour quit her job after working briefly for a salon, and she then unsuccessfully requested unemployment benefits. An unemployment-law judge heard the case and concluded that the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development appropriately denied her request. The judge reaffirmed that decision on reconsideration. We hold on appeal that the unemployment-law judge did not clearly err by finding that Tehranpour quit her job. We therefore affirm.

FACTS

Beauty Basics salon in Minneapolis employed Angela Tehranpour as an “esthetics instructor” from April to September in 2019, but most of that period included a medical leave of absence Tehranpour requested beginning in July and continuing through the end of her job. Tehranpour moved to California in September, effectively quitting her employment. She applied for unemployment benefits, and the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) denied the application.

Tehranpour appealed the denial, and an unemployment-law judge (ULJ) conducted an evidentiary hearing. During the hearing, Tehranpour’s husband indicated that she was suffering from anxiety, diminishing her ability to think and speak. With Tehranpour’s consent, the ULJ allowed Tehranpour’s husband to represent her. Tehranpour gave a short statement at the end of the hearing about her current job-seeking activity. Deciding the question of “[w]hether [Tehranpour] quit because of a good reason caused by the employer,” the ULJ found that she “quit the employment with Beauty Basics because she

had relocated to California and because she did not believe she would be able to medically perform the work required of her.” Tehranpour asked the ULJ to reconsider, and on reconsideration the ULJ affirmed his decision. Tehranpour appeals by certiorari.

D E C I S I O N

Tehranpour asserted many issues but offered few arguments on appeal. We do not consider supposed errors that are mere assertions lacking corresponding argument or cited authority unless prejudicial error is obvious to us. *State v. Modern Recycling, Inc.*, 558 N.W.2d 770, 772 (Minn. App. 1997). And we generally do not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal rather than during the underlying proceedings. *Thiele v. Stich*, 425 N.W.2d 580, 582 (Minn. 1988). Either as bald issue statements or as mere conclusory declarations, Tehranpour contends that the ULJ “failed to fully establish the record because [he] did not assist applicant with a mental health concern,” that the ULJ “failed to give notice to applicant about [an] ancillary issue discussed,” that she “challenges [the ULJ’s] decision that she is ineligible to receive unemployment benefits because she quit her employment,” that “the ULJ reached a decision without making mandatory credibility findings,” that she is entitled to an additional evidentiary hearing because “the Employer did not participate” in her hearing, that “the ULJ [inappropriately] revisited the three prior hearing issues,” and that during the hearing she was “withholding the main evidence which was the harassment that took place during the last week of her employment.” Tehranpour develops none of these assertions into any reasoned legal argument supported by authority and cited portions of the record. And she raises some of these points only on appeal. We therefore do not substantially address them, and we could affirm for this reason alone.

Despite Tehranpour having forfeited the right of review on these issues, we have nevertheless considered the record and conclude that the ULJ did not clearly err by finding that she quit her job for reasons not caused by her employer. When an applicant quits her job, she becomes ineligible for unemployment benefits unless, among other exceptions, she quit for a reason directly related to her employment and for which her employer is responsible. Minn. Stat. § 268.095, subd. 1 (2018). We rely on a ULJ's factual findings that the record substantially supports. *Fay v. Dep't of Emp't & Econ. Dev.*, 860 N.W.2d 385, 387 (Minn. App. 2015). We review de novo whether the factual findings support a ULJ's ineligibility decision. *Posey v. Securitas Sec. Servs. USA, Inc.*, 879 N.W.2d 662, 664 (Minn. App. 2016). On these standards, we have no cause to reverse here.

The record substantially supports the finding that Tehranpour quit her job on her own volition rather than because of any reason that Beauty Basics caused. Tehranpour's own testimony sufficiently supports the finding. She answered why she quit, saying, "I was totally not able to work from July 1 all the way to September 24 due to a serious medical mental health condition and domestic issue with my parents over my primary shelter." She also said, "We became homeless and we really didn't have an option but to relocate to California." Her husband's testimony corroborated hers. She cites nothing in the record, and we have seen nothing in the record, that even suggests that Beauty Basics caused either the housing difficulties that precipitated her move out of state or her medical problems. And regarding her concerns about the ULJ's lack of any express credibility assessment, none was necessary. No one but Tehranpour and her husband testified at the hearing, and

the ULJ's factual and legal conclusions demonstrate that he found credible their testimony about Tehranpour's reason for quitting.

Affirmed.