

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

GORAN KECMAN
3229 DARLENE COURT #7
WATERLOO IA 50701

DILLARD DEPARTMENT STORES INC
c/o BILLIE TREAT
1600 CANTRELL ROAD
LITTLE ROCK AR 72201-1110

ATTORNEY E J GALLAGHER
PO BOX 2615
WATERLOO IA 50704-2615

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-02434-BT
OC: 01/25/04 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (2)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

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.

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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Dillard Department Stores, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 25, 2004, reference 06, which held that Goran Kecman (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 April 6, 2004. The claimant participated in the hearing with Attorney E.J. Gallagher. Zeljka Krvavica participated as the interpreter for the claimant. The employer participated through Charlie Hufford, Store Manager.

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 full-time dock housekeeping associate from September 8, 2003 through January 21, 2004. He was discharged for a repeated failure to follow the employer's directives. On October 16, 2003, he received a verbal warning for violation of the work rules when he wore earrings to work. He received a written warning for multiple incidents. On October 23, 2003, the claimant and his co-workers were arguing about how the trailer should be unloaded. The employer directed the employees to stop arguing and the claimant was the only individual who continued. On October 28, 2003, a co-employee complained to the employer about the claimant not performing his job duties. The claimant threatened that co-employee and told the person if he did not get him inside the store, he would get him outside the store. The claimant was not being productive on November 8, 2003 and his supervisor had to repeatedly tell him to pick up the pace. The claimant was even standing near the dock not working at all in some instances. At one point, he was asked to take a flat bed of merchandise to the home store upstairs. He refused to do it and said that he did not give a "shit." The final incident occurred on January 20, 2004 when the claimant answered a page, directed to any dock employee, which was a request to assist in the women's bathroom as it had a clogged toilet. The claimant initially asked what he was supposed to do about it. He then stated he would take care of it but instead of completing the job, he continued sweeping the dock. He also carried out a package for a customer but still had sufficient time in which to do that while also fixing the toilet. The claimant left at the end of his shift.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective January 25, 2004 and has received benefits after the separation from employment in the amount of \$1,010.00.

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 Section 96.5-2-a.

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.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

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 propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. 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 Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

The claimant was discharged for a repeated failure to complete his job duties and to follow the employer's directives. Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). The claimant denies all wrongdoing but the employer's testimony was found more reliable as the claimant contradicted himself. The claimant's failure to complete his job duties 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 and benefits are denied.

Iowa Code Section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 25, 2004, reference 06, 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 claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,010.00.

sdb/kjf