

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

MASSARA G KOMJO
Claimant

IMMANUEL
Employer

APPEAL 24A-UI-05126-PT-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 04/28/24
Claimant: Respondent (2)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Immanuel, filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated May 20, 2024, (reference 01) that held the claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 14, 2024. The claimant, Massara Komjo, did not participate. The employer was represented by Equifax Representative Connie Hickerson and participated through RN Participant Care Aid Supervisor Rebekah Kiel and Director of Human Resources Business Partner Rebecca Aboe. The employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether the claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct.
Whether the claimant has been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, whether the repayment of those benefits to the agency can be waived.
Whether any charges to the employer's account can be waived.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant worked as a full-time participant care aid for Immanuel from June 12, 2023, until April 3, 2024, when she was discharged. As a participant care aid, the claimant was responsible for traveling to clients' homes and assisting the clients with their activities of daily living. The claimant worked Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The employer has an employee manual that includes policies on clocking-in and out of work and maintaining accurate timesheets. Employees use a program downloaded onto their work-cellphones to clock-in and out of work. Pursuant to the employer's policy, employees are to log into the app and clock-in when they arrive at a client's home and clock-out when they leave the client's home. The timekeeping program on the employees' work cellphones records both the time and location of when and where employees clock-in and out of work. The claimant

received a copy of the employee manual and was familiar with the employer's timekeeping policies.

Sometime in late-March 2024, the claimant's supervisor noticed that the time the claimant reported clocking-into work did not match the time she arrived at her assigned resident's home. The claimant's supervisor reviewed the claimant's timesheets and location records for the prior two weeks and discovered that on multiple occasions, the claimant either clocked-in at home before she drove to her assigned resident's home and/or did not clock out from work until after she arrived back at her home. By including her commute as "time worked," the claimant was paid for a significant amount of time she did not actually work.

On March 28, 2024, the employer issued the claimant a final written warning for misreporting her time in violation of the employer's timekeeping policy. Additionally, the claimant's supervisor met with the claimant and reviewed with her the employer's timekeeping policy. The disciplinary notice warned the claimant that further violations of the employer's timekeeping policy could result in discipline up to and including termination of employment.

On April 3, 2024, the employer audited the claimant's timesheets and location records. The audit revealed that, on that very morning, the claimant had clocked-into work from her home before driving to her assigned resident's home. Later that day, the employer called the claimant into a meeting and informed the claimant that her employment was being terminated effective immediately due to repeated violations of the employer's timekeeping policy.

The claimant's administrative records indicate that the claimant filed her original claim for benefits with an effective date of April 28, 2024. The claimant has filed weekly claims for benefits for three weeks between April 28 and June 1, 2024. The claimant has received total unemployment insurance benefits of \$1,164.00. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview with Iowa Workforce Development.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying, job-related 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.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)d(2) and (14) 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:

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 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

...

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

...

(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 Dept of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating the claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). 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. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

Reporting time on one’s timecard when one is not working is theft from the employer. Theft from an employer is generally disqualifying misconduct. *Ringland Johnson, Inc. v. Hunecke*, 585 N.W.2d 269, 272 (Iowa 1998). In *Ringland*, the Court found a single attempted theft to be misconduct as a matter of law.

The employer has presented substantial and credible evidence that for several weeks prior to the claimant’s termination, the claimant regularly commuted to and from work while still “on the clock.” The claimant was not authorized to include her commute as work time and the weight of the evidence indicates that claimant performed no job duties during that time. What is more, the claimant continued commuting while “on the clock” even after receiving a final written warning on March 28, 2024, for misreporting her time. As such, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant intentionally misreported her time to reflect time that she did not actually work. The claimant’s decision to clock-in before commuting to work and clock-out after arriving home from work resulted in the claimant being paid for time she did not actually work.

A company policy against theft is not necessary; honesty is a reasonable, commonly accepted duty owed to the employer. The claimant submitted timecards reflecting that she should be paid for time that she did not work. The claimant’s theft was contrary to the best interests of her employer. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes:

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

Payment – determination – duration – child support intercept.

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) (a) 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 employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) 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.

(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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee

with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The unemployment insurance law 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. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,164.00 for three weeks between April 28 and June 1, 2024. There is no evidence that the claimant received these benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation. Because the employer participated in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The May 20, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for substantial job-related misconduct. Unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa are denied until the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount after the April 3, 2024, separation date, and provided she is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits in the gross amount of \$1,164.00 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in fact-finding. The employer's account shall not be charged.



Patrick B. Thomas
Administrative Law Judge

June 19, 2024
Decision Dated and Mailed

PBT/rvs

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.