

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

JEREMIAH L SLIFE
Claimant

AMEGA GARAGE DOOR AND OPENER INC
Employer

APPEAL 24A-UI-03848-S2-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 03/24/24
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the April 5, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a finding that claimant was discharged with no evidence of misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 2, 2024. Claimant Jeremiah Slife participated personally. Employer Amega Garage Door and Opener, Inc. participated through owner Dwayne Carter. Steve Wissler, Aaron Chenchar, and Marcia Derby observed on behalf of employer. Employer's Exhibits A - F were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as a director of operations from August 1, 2023, and was separated from employment on March 25, 2024, when he was discharged.

Claimant and owner Dwayne Carter agreed prior to claimant's start date that he would work for employer for one to two years to learn the business before purchasing the business himself. Claimant had the business assessed prior to taking the position. Claimant was initially focusing on learning about the business and employees and earning sales before moving into more of a management role.

Shortly after hire, Mr. Carter realized he did not like claimant's suggestions on ways to improve the business, such as purchasing a software system to eliminate the expense of paper

documents. Mr. Carter also expected claimant to bring in more business through sales; however, there was not set expectation as to how much in sales claimant was expected to obtain.

In December 2023, Mr. Carter became upset when he discovered claimant used the job title "director of operations" on his LinkedIn page, as well as in other communications. (Exhibit B). Claimant met with employer to discuss his use of the title, but he did not remove it from his pages. This title was agreed upon by Mr. Carter and claimant at the time of his hire. Claimant's signed acknowledgment of employee policies lists his position as director of operations. (Exhibit A). Employer could not obtain a better benefits package from the insurance company without giving claimant a title that set him apart from the other employees, who worked as installers and in office positions. Claimant believed he was hired as the director of operations.

On March 21, 2024, claimant and Mr. Carter spoke about the need for claimant to bring in new business, and Mr. Carter offered claimant use of a new company truck. During this conversation, claimant asked Mr. Carter if he would consider not making cash deals on the side, because he felt that was unfair to the company because it took food off of his table and that of other employees. Mr. Carter became upset, and told claimant he would not sell the business to him for less than \$6.5 million dollars. This was over two million dollars higher than the business was assessed at. On March 25, 2024, after employer had time to think about this conversation and claimant's employment, employer discharged claimant for insubordination for failing to remove his job title on various websites and for poor job performance for not bringing in enough new customers.

Employer did not issue disciplinary action to claimant prior to his discharge. Claimant did not perform his job to employer's satisfaction at any point during his employment.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,878.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of March 24, 2024, for the three weeks ending April 27, 2024. Employer participated in the fact-finding interview through witness Dwayne Carter.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

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 Code section 96.5(2)b, c and d provide:

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:

b. Provided further, if gross misconduct is established, the department shall cancel the individual's wage credits earned, prior to the date of discharge, from all employers.

c. Gross misconduct is deemed to have occurred after a claimant loses employment as a result of an act constituting an indictable offense in connection with the claimant's employment, provided the claimant is duly convicted thereof or has signed a statement admitting the commission of such an act. Determinations regarding a benefit claim may be redetermined within five years from the effective date of the claim. Any benefits paid to a claimant prior to a determination that the claimant has lost employment as a result of such act shall not be considered to have been accepted by the claimant in good faith.

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "*misconduct*" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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 even 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

(1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.

(2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.

(3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.

(4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.

(5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual is compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.

(6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.

(7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that result in missing work.

(8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.

(10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.

(11) Failure to maintain any licenses, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.

(12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.

(13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

(14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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).

The decision in this case rests, at least in part, on the credibility of the witnesses. It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how the disputed factual issues were resolved. After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, reviewing the exhibits submitted by the parties, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge finds the claimant's version of events to be more credible than the employer's recollection of those events.

Insubordination

An employee's failure to perform a specific task may not constitute misconduct if such failure is in good faith or for good cause. See *Woods v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 327 N.W.2d 768, 771 (Iowa 1982). "[W]illful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey the reasonable instructions of his employer." *Myers v. IDJS*, 373 N.W.2d 507, 510 (Iowa 1983) (quoting *Sturniolo v. Commonwealth, Unemployment Compensation Bd. of Review*, 19 Cmwlth. 475, 338 A.2d 794, 796 (1975)); *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679, 680 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

In insubordination cases, the reasonableness of the employer's demand in light of the circumstances must be evaluated, along with the worker's reason for non-compliance. See *Endicott v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 367 N.W.2d 300 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). The key to such cases is not the worker's subjective point of view but "what a reasonable person would have believed under the circumstances." *Aalbers v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 431 N.W.2d 330, 337 (Iowa 1988); accord *O'Brien v. EAB*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (Iowa 1993) (objective good faith is test in quits for good cause). For example, in *Green v. IDJS*, 299 N.W.2d 651 (Iowa 1980) an employee refused to sign a warning to acknowledge that she understood why she was being warned. The Court found the refusal to be disqualifying as a matter of law, and did not focus on whether the warning was justified or not. *Green* at 655. The claimant's actions in refusing to do as told "show[ed] an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer." 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a).

Here, one of the reasons employer discharged claimant was because he failed to remove the title of director of operations from various websites. However, this was the title agreed upon at hire for claimant, so employer's request to then have claimant remove it is not reasonable. While employer wished to emphasize that his employees do not have job titles because none are listed on the business cards, it is clear that they all have assigned tasks that would fall under a particular title. It would be unusual that a person who is learning the business because he plans to acquire it would not be allowed to use a managerial job title. Employer's request was not reasonable and therefore employer has not established claimant was insubordinate.

Job performance


Employer's other reason for discharging claimant was because of poor job performance. Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979). Where an individual is discharged due to a failure in job performance, proof of that individual's ability to do the job is required to justify disqualification, rather than accepting the employer's subjective view. To do so is to impermissibly shift the burden of proof to the claimant. *Kelly v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). At no point was claimant given sales goals or targets he was required to meet. Further, since the employer agreed that claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which he performed his job duties to employer's satisfaction and inasmuch as he did attempt to perform the job to the best of his ability but was unable to meet its expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

As a result, employer has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant engaged in misconduct that would disqualify him from benefits. Benefits are allowed.

Because claimant is eligible for benefits, the issues of overpayment of regular unemployment insurance benefits and relief of charges are moot.

DECISION:

The April 5, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. There was no disqualifying separation. The claimant is allowed benefits, provided they remain otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment and chargeability are moot.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Stephanie Adkisson", written in dark ink on a light-colored rectangular background.

Stephanie Adkisson
Administrative Law Judge

May 6, 2024
Decision Dated and Mailed

scn

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov**

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.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL 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.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or 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.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
En línea: eab.iowa.gov**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiriera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.