

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**TAMMY R TUREK**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-09674-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**GOOD SAMARITAN SOCIETY INC**  
Employer

**OC: 07/08/12**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2-R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed an appeal from the August 3, 2012 (reference 01) decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on September 4, 2012. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Human Resources Coordinator Janice Foot and Administrator Brandi Petrik. Employer's Exhibits 1 (pages 1 – 4) and 2 were admitted to the record. Claimant's Exhibit A (pages 2 – 17) was admitted to the record.

**ISSUES:**

Did employer discharge claimant for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits?

Is the claimant overpaid benefits?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a housekeeping assistant from 2010 and was separated from employment on July 16, 2012. Her last day of work was July 11. She had a work-related right rotator cuff tear diagnosed by Kirk Hutton, M.D., of OrthoWest on June 1, 2009 while working for another employer. She had surgery and Hutton released her without restrictions on September 23, 2009. (Claimant's Exhibit A, pages 2 - 6) She sought treatment from Hutton and OrthoWest again on May 4, 2012 for a right rotator cuff strain/tendonitis and was taken off work from May 4 to May 14, 2012, and again from June 11 through June 17, 2012. (Claimant's Exhibit A, pages 7-9, 15, 16) A report of the injury was completed on May 22, 2012 in which she disclosed the 2009 injury. (Claimant's Exhibit A, pages 10, 11) At the time of hire, she completed a medical history questionnaire and claimed that she had not ever experienced joint or muscle pain or muscle weakness. (Employer's Exhibit 1, page 1) She also indicated she had no other physical medical conditions that may impair her ability to perform her job. (Employer's Exhibit 1, page 2) She reported that she had never filed a workers' compensation claim and did not have any work restrictions. (Employer's Exhibit 1, page 3) Her medical

release to work from Hutton dated July 5, 2012 reported she had permanent work restrictions since 2009 of not lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling more than ten pounds. (Employer's Exhibit 2) Her job requires lifting 30 pounds. She verbally advised the employer about the 2009 workers' compensation claim but said it was "totally resolved."

Claimant received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of July 8, 2012.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

Employer has presented substantial and credible evidence that claimant substantially misrepresented her medical history and permanent restrictions at the time of hire. This is disqualifying misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Because claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which claimant was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits.

**DECISION:**

The August 3, 2012 (reference 01) decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

**REMAND:**

The matter of determining the amount of the potential overpayment and whether the overpayment should be recovered under Iowa Code § 96.3(7)b is remanded to the Agency.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/kjw