



Dep't of Emp. Sec., 142 Vt. 90, 92 (1982). Moreover, “the purpose of the unemployment compensation law is not to provide sick benefits nor to compensate those who cease working because of illness.” LaFountain v. Dep't of Lab., 2018 VT 31, ¶ 7, 207 Vt. 120 (quotation omitted). This Court must implement the statute as written and “is not free to enlarge its scope by an unwarranted interpretation of statutory language.” Hunt, 142 Vt. at 93.

Here, the statutory language is clear that eligibility requires a claimant to be able and available to work. The evidence supports the Board’s finding that claimant was not able and available to work—indeed, claimant does not contest this fact. Even accepting claimant’s assertion that she was provided with inconsistent information from Department staff, this provides no basis to award benefits where they are not due under the statute. The Court is obligated to enforce the statute as written. Because claimant did not meet the statutory eligibility requirements, the Board properly denied her benefits.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

---

Harold E. Eaton, Jr., Associate Justice

---

Karen R. Carroll, Associate Justice

---

William D. Cohen, Associate Justice