

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

KELLI J MAURO
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 06A-UI-08371-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MURPHY OIL USA INC
Employer

**OC: 07/16/06 R: 02
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Murphy Oil USA (employer) appealed a representative's August 11, 2006 decision (reference 02) that concluded Kelli Mauro (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on September 6, 2006. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Rhonda King, Store Manager. The employer offered one exhibit, which was marked for identification as Exhibit One. Exhibit One was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct and, therefore, not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on April 6, 2006, as a full-time assistant manager. The claimant used the work telephone and computer for personal use. Her teenage child spent time at the workplace. The employer told the claimant to stop these types of actions. The employer issued the claimant written warnings on June 30 and July 10, 2006, for failing to properly complete the weekly inventory. The claimant wrote notes in the margins rather than in the grid and did not count all grocery items. The employer warned the claimant that further infractions could result in her termination from employment. The employer worked with the claimant and found the claimant knew how to properly complete the form.

On July 12, 2006, the employer found that the claimant did not inventory the grocery items. The employer terminated the claimant on July 15, 2006.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the following reasons, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged for 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.

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 of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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). An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to perform a proper weekly inventory after demonstrating that she knew how to perform the task. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, she is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

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.

The claimant has received benefits in the amount of \$2,226.00 since filing her claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits now constitute an overpayment which must be repaid.

DECISION:

The representative's August 11, 2006 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,226.00.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw