

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

BILL R NORTHAMER
Claimant

ICC LLC
Employer

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-14751-VST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 11/11/12
Claimant: Respondent (2R)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated December 7, 2012, reference 01, which held that the claimant was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on January 17, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Becca Klopfenstein, office accounting. The record consists of the testimony of Becca Klopfenstein; the testimony of Bill Northamer; and Employer's Exhibits 1-4.

ISSUES:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct; and
Whether the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having considered all of the evidence in the record, makes the following findings of fact:

The employer is engaged in fire and water restoration and cleanup. The claimant was hired on June 15, 2010, as a technician/construction. The claimant's last day of work was November 8, 2012. He was terminated on November 12, 2012.

The incident that led to the claimant's termination occurred on November 9, 2012. The claimant came to work that day and was asked to "pack out." This job entails moving and covering furniture or removing items from a house that is going to be restored. The claimant did not want to do pack out, even though he admitted that he had done that job before. He felt he should only be asked to do construction work. He clocked out and walked off the job.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

Misconduct that disqualifies an individual from receiving unemployment insurance benefits occurs when there are deliberate acts or omissions that constitute a material breach of the worker's duty to the employer. Insubordination, which is the continued failure to follow reasonable instructions, constitutes misconduct. See Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). The employer has the burden of proof to show misconduct.

The claimant is not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. He admitted that on November 9, 2012, he refused to do a job as directed by his employer. The claimant normally worked construction but had been asked to "pack out" previously. He did not want to pack out and refused to do what his employer asked him to do. He tried to justify his refusal by saying he was not trained to do the work and that there were other employees who could do the work. This explanation is not sufficient. The claimant had done the job before and the employer had employees present who would do the more intricate part of the job, which was preparing the inventory. The employer had the right to assign the claimant to do the pack out job. His refusal is insubordination, which is disqualifying misconduct. Benefits are denied.

The next issue is overpayment of benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. 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.

b. (1) 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. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The overpayment issue is remanded to the claims section for determination.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated December 7, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The overpayment issue is remanded to the claims section for determination.

Vicki L. Seeck
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

vls/pjs