IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

MORGAN M BANKER

Claimant

APPEAL 23A-UI-07643-PT-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

PURELIGHT POWER LLC

Employer

OC: 06/25/23

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated July 31, 2023, (reference 02) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After due notice, a hearing was held on August 22, 2023. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through People Experience Director Charlott Hintz and Director of Customer Experience Kenny Freeman. Employer's Exhibit 1 and Claimant's Exhibit A were admitted into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for the employer on June 29, 2023. The employer discharged claimant on June 29, 2023, due to violations of the employer's timekeeping policies.

Claimant was employed as a full-time solar repair technician from July 5, 2022, until her employment with Purelight Power LLC ended on June 29, 2023. As a solar repair technician, claimant was responsible for traveling to clients' homes and businesses to troubleshoot and repair solar panels.

The employer has a written employee manual that includes policies on clocking-in and out of work, maintaining accurate timesheets, and limiting employee breaks to fifteen-minutes in the morning and afternoon. Employees use a program downloaded onto their work-cellphones to clock-in and out of work. Pursuant to the employer's policy, employees may include work performed for the company away from a job site or at home as "time worked" if the employee receives prior approval from their supervisor to do so. Claimant received a copy of the employee manual and was aware of the employer's timekeeping policies.

On June 27, 2023, claimant's supervisor noticed that the time claimant reported clocking-in to work did not match the time she had actually arrived at the job site. The timekeeping program

on employees' work cellphones records both the time and location of when and where employees clock in and out of work. Claimant's supervisor reviewed claimant's timekeeping records for the previous two pay periods and discovered that on multiple occasions, claimant either clocked-in at home before she drove to work and/or did not clock out from work until after she arrived home. Claimant lived approximately thirty-miles from the employer's premises, so including her commute as "time worked" resulted in claimant being paid for several hours that she did not actually work.

Claimant's supervisor reported the results of his initial investigation to the Human Resources Department. A human resources manager further investigated the matter and discovered that claimant had engaged in this pattern of behavior for several months and that it had sometimes resulted in claimant being paid overtime. After conferring with the human resources manager, claimant's supervisor called and informed claimant that her employment was being terminated effective immediately due to violations of the employer's timekeeping policy.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Iowa Code section 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.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)d(14) provides:

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:
- d. For the purposes of this subsection, "misconduct" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:
- (14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982).

The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

Reporting time on one's timecard when one is not working is theft from the employer. Theft from an employer is generally disqualifying misconduct. *Ringland Johnson, Inc. v. Hunecke*, 585 N.W.2d 269, 272 (Iowa 1998). In *Ringland*, the Court found a single attempted theft to be misconduct as a matter of law.

The employer has presented substantial and credible evidence that for several months prior to claimant's termination, claimant regularly commuted to and from work while still "on the clock." Claimant was not authorized to include her commute as work time and the weight of the evidence supports the conclusion that claimant performed no job duties during a significant portion of that time. As such, the administrative law judge concludes that claimant misreported her time to reflect time that she did not actually work. Claimant's decision to clock-in before commuting to work and clock-out after arriving home from work resulted in claimant being paid for time she did not actually work.

A company policy against theft is not necessary; honesty is a reasonable, commonly accepted duty owed to the employer. Claimant submitted timecards reflecting that she should be paid for time that she did not work. Claimant's theft was contrary to the best interests of her employer. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes that claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The July 31, 2023, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Patrick B. Thomas

Administrative Law Judge

August 28, 2023

Decision Dated and Mailed

PBT/jkb

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.