

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

MICHAEL TOMPKINS
Claimant

KWIK TRIP INC
Employer

APPEAL 22A-UI-05335-JD-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 01/30/22
Claimant: Respondent (3)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit
Iowa Code § 96.5 (2) a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Rep. Participation in Fact-Finding

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On February 28, 2022, the employer filed an appeal from the February 21, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on a determination that the claimant was discharged from for no disqualifying misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 8, 2022. Claimant did not participate. Employer participated through Julie Stumbo, Store Leader. Employer's Exhibit1 was admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on June 23, 2019. Claimant last worked as a full-time guest services worker. Claimant was separated from employment on January 31, 2022, when he was discharged for repeated violations of the employer's food handling safety policies. The claimant was given extensive training on proper safe food handling by the employer. (Emp. Ex. 1- Training Certificate). The claimant was given written warnings on December 23, 2021, January 3, 2022, for not properly handling raw chicken and wearing rings and other jewelry. On January 17, 19, 2022, the claimant failed to wear a disposable uniform while handling chicken and was observed not washing his hands as he moved from task to task. All in violation of the employer's written policy. The claimant's last day worked was January 19, 2022, and he was removed from the company's payroll.

The administrative record reflects that the claimant has been paid \$1,525.00 for the five-week period ending on April 2, 2022.

The employer submitted all of the necessary documents on the SIDES system but was not contacted for any opportunity for rebuttal. The employer was not given sufficient opportunity to participate in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

Causes for disqualification.

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Claimant's repeated failure to properly follow safe food handling protocols after repeated warnings is evidence of negligence or carelessness to such a degree of recurrence as to rise to the level of disqualifying job-related misconduct. See Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a. The employer met its burden in proving job disqualifying misconduct.

The administrative law judge further concludes that the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

I

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a-b, 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) (a) 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. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) 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.

(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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the

quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871-subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7) "b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.


Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he 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 those 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 shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b)(1)(a).

In this case, the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. As such, the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency benefits she received in connection with this employer's account.

However, the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits because it did not receive notice of the fact finding interview and did not receive a telephone call when the fact finding interview was conducted. Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b)(1)(a) provides: “[t]he employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer *failed to respond timely or adequately to the department’s request for information* relating to the payment of benefits.” (emphasis added). In this case the employer did not fail to timely or adequately respond to a request for information because the employer did not receive the notice of fact-finding interview and did not receive a telephone call from the interview as the telephone number being called was not associated with this employer. The benefits paid to claimant in this case were not because the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department’s request for information. As such, the employer cannot be charged for the overpayment either and the overpayment shall be absorbed by the fund.

DECISION:

The February 21, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is modified in favor of the appellant. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,525.00 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview through no fault of its own and its account shall not be charged. The claimant’s overpayment of \$1,525.00 shall be absorbed by the fund.



Jason Dunn
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515) 478-3528

April 13, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

jd/scn