

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

PHILLIP D WILLIAMS
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-01139-PT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

OC: 11/07/10
Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayments

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated January 21, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on March 3, 2011. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Jenny Mora, employment manager. Employer Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct and is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was employed from September 11, 2006 through November 10, 2010. He was a maintenance mechanic. He was discharged for not changing plastic on the floor but instead changing the date signifying that he had changed the plastic. This occurred on November 9, 2010. This is a sanitation issue and caused the USDA to issue an NR or violation to the employer. The claimant had been given a written warning regarding this same action on February 26, 2010. At that time he was advised that he would be terminated if it occurred again. The claimant admits that he did violate this policy again after the written warning but contends that he did not do so on November 9, 2010. He did not assert this claim at the time of his third step grievance on December 1, 2010. The employer has no record of the claimant being off of work on November 9, 2010 as claimant contends.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning changing plastic. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because the employer has a right to expect the claimant will be honest in his reports and that claimant will perform the work he tells the employer he has performed. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

The next issue concerns an overpayment of unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa 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.

This matter is remanded to claims section for determination of an overpayment.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated January 21, 2011, 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. This matter is remanded to the claims section for determination of an overpayment.

Ron Pohlman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/pjs