# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

STEPHANIE K RIBBLE

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-06855-H2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**HOME DEPOT USA INC** 

Employer

OC: 04-17-11

Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the May 12, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on June 20, 2011. The claimant did participate and was represented by Dave Nagle, Attorney at Law. The employer did participate through Ted Gehreke, Store Manager and Joel Roberts, District Operations Manager.

#### **ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged due to job related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a cashier/bookkeeper part time beginning March 15, 2010 through April 21, 2011 when she was discharged. The claimant was responsible for counting cash drawers. The employer began to notice an increase in cash shortages between March 21, and April 7 and began an investigation. The common denominator in all the cash drawer shortages was the claimant was the one working in the vault on each of those days. Mr. Roberts brought her in for questioning about the cash shortages on April 21, 2011 beginning at 9:15 a.m. through 9:46 a.m. During the interview the claimant admitted that she had taken one-hundred dollars from the money she was counting. The claimant was discharged for theft from the employer. When Mr. Gehrke met with the claimant to give her the termination notice, at no time did the claimant tell Mr. Gehrke or anyone else that she was only "role playing" with Mr. Roberts when she admitted to stealing from the employer. The claimant voluntarily wrote out a statement during the interview in which she freely admitted to the theft from the employer.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of April 17, 2011.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

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.

Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). The claimant was not coerced into confessing that she stole the money. The administrative law judge is not persuaded that the claimant thought she was "role playing" when she admitted the theft, she is now claiming that in order to obtain unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant never told the employer that she was only "role playing" when they told her she was being discharged for theft. Theft from the employer is sufficient misconduct to disqualify the claimant from receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are denied.

lowa Code § 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. 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 whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits.

# **DECISION:**

The May 12, 2011 (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

# **REMAND**:

The	matter	of	determining	the	amount	of	the	potential	overpayment	and	whether	the
over	payment	sh	ould be recov	ered	under lov	va (	Code	§ 96.3(7)b	is remanded t	o the	Agency.	

\_\_\_\_\_

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs