# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**ALEX MEADOR** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-02705-SWT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**WEAVER ENTERPRISES LTD** 

Employer

OC: 01/17/10

Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment of Benefits

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 10, 2010, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on March 25, 2010. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. Joe Rechfertig participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

### ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct? Was the claimant overpaid unemployment insurance benefits?

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked for the employer as a team member from January 2008 to January 15, 2010.

The claimant had heard from a manager that food was being stolen from the restaurant. The claimant decided to see if he could find out who was taking the food so he started asking other employees. He asked one employee if he knew who was taking the food. The employee said it wasn't him. The claimant then willfully misrepresented information by telling the employee that management suspected the employee was stealing from the store. This was not true.

When the employee brought what the claimant said to him to management, the claimant was discharged on January 15, 2010, for making false statements to coworkers.

The claimant filed for and received a total of \$1,836.00 in unemployment insurance benefits for the weeks between January 17 and March 20, 2010.

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

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

The unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a. The rules define misconduct as (1) deliberate acts or omissions by a worker that materially breach the duties and obligations arising out of the contract of employment, (2) deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of employees, or (3) carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design. 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 misconduct within the meaning of the statute. 871 IAC 24.32(1).

The claimant's making a false statement to a coworker was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits to 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. But the overpayment will not be recovered when an initial determination to award benefits is reversed on appeal 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 section 96.3-7. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was ineligible for those benefits. The matter of deciding the amount of the overpayment and whether the overpayment should be recovered under lowa Code section 96.3-7-b is remanded to the Agency.

## **DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 10, 2010, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits until he has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The matter of deciding the amount of the overpayment and whether the overpayment should be recovered under lowa Code section 96.3-7-b is remanded to the Agency.

Steven A. Wise Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
saw/pjs	