IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

KATELYN R FINNIGAN

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-11797-JD-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

RECOVER HEALTH SERVICES LLC

Employer

OC: 03/07/21

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On May 5, 2021, Katelyn Finnigan (claimant/appellant) filed a timely appeal from the Iowa Workforce Development decision dated April 27, 2021 (reference 01) that denied benefits based on a finding claimant was discharged from work on March 7, 2021 for violation of a known company rule.

A telephone hearing was held on July 14, 2021. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. The claimant participated personally. Recovery Health Services LLC (employer/respondent) did not register a number for the hearing or participate.

The hearing was conducted by Administrative Law Judge Jason Dunn. No exhibits were admitted. Administrative Law Judge Andrew Duffelmeyer has reviewed the record in its entirety and makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

ISSUES:

I. Was the separation from employment a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

Claimant worked for employer as a part-time nurse's aide. Claimant's first day of employment was March 11, 2019. The last day claimant worked on the job was March 10, 2021. Claimant was discharged on that date. Claimant was discharged due to bringing her nine-year-old child to work with her on several occasions. She knew this was a violation of company policy.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons set forth below, the decision dated April 27, 2021 (reference 01) that denied benefits based on a finding claimant was discharged from work on March 7, 2021 for violation of a known company rule is AFFIRMED.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a 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:
- 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 provides in relevant part:

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).

The employer bears the burden of proving that a claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits because of substantial misconduct within the meaning of Iowa Code section 96.5(2). *Myers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734, 737 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). 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). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually

indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Newman, Id.* In contrast, 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. *Newman, Id.*

When reviewing an alleged act of misconduct, the finder of fact may consider past acts of misconduct to determine the magnitude of the current act. *Kelly v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552, 554 (Iowa Ct. App.1986). However, conduct asserted to be disqualifying misconduct must be both specific and current. *West v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 489 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa 1992); *Greene v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Because our unemployment compensation law is designed to protect workers from financial hardships when they become unemployed through no fault of their own, we construe the provisions "liberally to carry out its humane and beneficial purpose." *Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 570 N.W.2d 85, 96 (Iowa 1997). "[C]ode provisions which operate to work a forfeiture of benefits are strongly construed in favor of the claimant." *Diggs v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 478 N.W.2d 432, 434 (Iowa Ct. App. 1991).

Employer has carried its burden of proving claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits because of a current act of substantial misconduct within the meaning of Iowa Code section 96.5(2). On several occasions claimant violated a company policy that she was aware. This was a deliberate act which constituted a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of her contract of employment. Benefits are denied effective with the date of separation.

DECISION:

The decision dated April 27, 2021 (reference 01) that denied benefits based on a finding claimant was discharged from work on March 7, 2021 for violation of a known company rule is AFFIRMED. Claimant's separation from employment was disqualifying. Benefits must be denied, and employer's account shall not be charged. This disqualification shall continue until claimant has earned wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is not otherwise disqualified or ineligible.

Andrew B. Duffelmeyer

Administrative Law Judge

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

and Nyplmus

1000 East Grand Avenue

Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209

Fax (515) 478-3528

August 24, 2021

Decision Dated and Mailed

abd/scn

Note to Claimant:

If you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal with the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. If this decision denies benefits, you may be responsible for paying back benefits already received.

Individuals who are disqualified from or are otherwise ineligible for <u>regular</u> unemployment insurance benefits but who are unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information.