

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JAMES LOCKMAN
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-11762-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CASEY'S MARKETING CO
Employer

OC: 06/14/09
Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Casey's Marketing Company (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated August 7, 2009, reference 02, which held that James Lockman (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on September 4, 2009. The claimant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which he could be contacted, and therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Brian Petersen, Manager. Employer's Exhibit One was admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a part-time cashier/clerk from December 2, 2008 through April 27, 2009 when he was discharged. Shortly after he was hired, he issued four checks to the employer which were returned for nonsufficient funds. He wrote a check on December 4, 2008 for \$16.05; a check on December 6, 2008 for \$23.55; a check on December 17, 2008 for \$15.45; and a check on December 22, 2008 for \$26.66. The employer became aware of the checks in February 2009 and the claimant signed an agreement on February 24, 2009 that he would make payments to Check Alert until his debt was paid. He had not made any payments by March 1, 2009 and the employer told him he had until May 1, 2009 to pay it.

The claimant had been warned about taking movie rentals home without paying for them. However, he took four movies home on April 24, 2009 without paying for them. Movies are rented for 24 hours but the claimant had still not returned the movies by April 27, 2009. The store manager had been out of town for a funeral and the claimant was supposed to work on

April 26, 2009 but was a no-call/no-show. After the store manager returned on April 27, 2009, he confirmed the claimant had not paid his overdraft debt. The claimant was discharged for the overdraft debt, the movies and the no-call/no-show.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective June 14, 2009 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for a second no-call/no-show, a repeated failure to pay for movie rental fees and an overdraft debt that was over five months old. He had been warned but continued to disregard the employer's interests. The claimant's conduct shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the

employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) 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. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 7, 2009, reference 02, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until 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 matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/pjs