

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

IVAN SHORT
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-06285-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

JELD-WEN INC
Employer

OC: 02/06/11
Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Jeld-Wen, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated May 3, 2011, reference 02, which held that Ivan Short (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 June 9, 2011. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Gayle Kingery, human resources associate; Brad Harris, coordinating manager; and Alex Damp, employer representative. Employer's Exhibits One through Four were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, 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 having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time general laborer from August 30, 2010 through March 29, 2011, when he was discharged for a repeated violation of the employer's violence in the workplace policy. The employer prohibits violence, threats, harassment, intimidation, and other disruptive behavior, and violation of this policy subjects the employee to disciplinary action up to and including termination. The claimant received a written warning on January 17, 2011 for a confrontation between himself and Justin Young, which culminated in the claimant asking Mr. Young if he wanted to take it outside. The manager told the claimant that any further confrontations may result in termination.

The claimant had another confrontation with Mr. Young on March 23, 2011, when Mr. Young was trying to assist the claimant from pushing material down the line too fast. The matter would have escalated had Mr. Young not walked away when the claimant told Mr. Young to get out of his area. Co-employee Jeff Stevens later heard the claimant telling someone else that he was going to "beat up" Mr. Young. Mr. Stevens advised the employer that the claimant does not get

along well with the other people on the line and another co-worker named Ron Shook corroborated Mr. Steven's statements. Mr. Shook reported to the employer that the claimant caused problems with other employees. The claimant denied saying he was going to "beat up" Mr. Young, but he did admit that he told Mr. Young to get out of his area. Since the claimant had been previously warned, he was subsequently discharged.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective February 6, 2011 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 on March 29, 2011 for a repeated violation of the employer's violence in the workplace policy. He knew he was on a final warning and his conduct on March 23, 2011 was in violation of the employer's policy. 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 May 3, 2011, 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/kjw