# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**LORNA M DRAVES** 

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-03523-DT** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**CRESCENT ELECTRIC SUPPLY COMPANY** 

Employer

OC: 02/25/07 R: 03 Claimant: Respondent (2)

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

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Crescent Electric Supply Company, Inc. (employer) appealed a representative's March 22, 2007 decision (reference 01) that concluded Lorna M. Draves (claimant) was qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 2, 2007. The claimant participated in the hearing. Peter Cipriano of TALX Employer Services appeared on the employer's behalf and presented testimony from two witnesses, Dan Splinter and Jason Farrington. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

#### **ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

# **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The claimant started working for the employer on May 9, 1995. Since at least 2000, she worked full time as a clerical employee at the employer's Cedar Rapids, Iowa, electrical wholesale distribution facility. Her last day of work was March 1, 2007. The employer discharged her on that date. The stated reason for the discharge was being verbally abusive to another employee.

In late December 2006 there had been an incident between the claimant and Mr. Farrington, a counter sales person, in which the claimant lost her temper and yelled at Mr. Farrington. This was verbally addressed by Mr. Splinter, the district manager, with the claimant on January 3, 2007, and she apologized. On February 21, 2007, Mr. Splinter addressed some work procedure issues with the claimant as well as her attitude, telling her that other employees were afraid to address issues with her for fear of being yelled at. She was told that the situation would be reviewed for improvement on or about May 1

On February 28 the claimant was speaking to another employee about Mr. Farrington, saying that he could not do anything right. Mr. Farrington could hear the claimant from his work area which was about 30 feet away, and walked over to the claimant's work area to tell her to stop talking about him. She began screaming at him, calling him a "f - - - ing idiot" and yelling several times that he was stupid and that he could not do anything right. Other employees working in other areas 30 to 40 feet

away could hear the claimant screaming at him. Mr. Farrington complained to his manager; upon Mr. Splinter's investigation of the incident, he determined to discharge the claimant under the employer's non-harassment policy.

The claimant established a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective February 25, 2007. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits after the separation from employment in the amount of \$2,429.00.

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

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982); Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

The focus of the definition of misconduct is on acts or omissions by a claimant that "rise to the level of being deliberate, intentional or culpable." <u>Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The acts must show:

- 1. Willful and wanton disregard of an employer's interest, such as found in:
  - a. Deliberate violation of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of its employees, or
  - b. Deliberate disregard of standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of its employees; or

- 2. Carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to:
  - a. Manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design; or
  - b. Show an intentional and substantial disregard of:
    - 1. The employer's interest, or
    - 2. The employee's duties and obligations to the employer.

The claimant's screaming and yelling at her coworker, particularly after the prior discussions, shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer discharged the claimant for reasons amounting to work-connected misconduct.

Iowa Code § 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of lowa law.

# **DECISION:**

The representative's March 22, 2007 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer discharged the claimant for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as of February 25, 2007. This disqualification continues until the claimant has been paid ten times her weekly benefit amount for insured work, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account will not be charged. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,429.00.

Lynette A. F. Donner Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	

ld/kjw