

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

METHUSELAH K GEE
Claimant

KUM & GO LC
Employer

APPEAL 18R-UI-00500-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 11/05/17
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
871 IAC 24.10 – Employer Participation in the fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the November 17, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 7, 2018. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Jerri Ferrell, General Manager.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged due to job connected misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a sales manager beginning on May 8, 2017 through November 13, 2017 when he was discharged. The claimant had poor attendance and had been warned both verbally and in writing. As a manager, he was expected to follow the attendance rules as an example for other employees. The claimant had at least two instances of being a no-call/no-show on August 1 and August 5. Ms. Ferrell spoke to him on August 7 and told him that he was expected to call the employer to report his absences so the employer could make arrangements to cover his shift. The claimant was given a verbal warning on August 7 about his poor attendance and his failure to follow the notification policy.

On September 9, the claimant was again a no-call/no-show for work. On September 10, the claimant sent Ms. Ferrell a text telling her he had been hurt on September 9 and lost his phone so he could not call her. Ms. Ferrell told the claimant to arrive for his next shift on September 12

one-half hour early so she could talk to him about the incident. The claimant was given a written warning on September 12 for his repeated attendance violations. The written warning put him on notice that any further incident would result in his discharge.

On October 17, the claimant was transferred to another store. Nura was the general manager at that store, but the claimant also continued to report to Ms. Ferrell. Nura was told that the claimant had reached the point in his disciplinary history where if he had one more attendance occurrence he would be discharged.

The claimant called in sick to work twenty minutes prior to the start of his shift on November 1. He was told by Nura that he was not properly reporting his absence and could lose his job. At no time did Nura tell the claimant that he was discharged.

On November 2, the claimant sent a text to Ms. Ferrell asking if he still had a job. Ms. Ferrell specifically told him that she was waiting to hear from Dan, but that it might be awhile before Dan got back to her. At no time did Ms. Ferrell tell the claimant to stop reporting to work or did she tell him he was discharged. The claimant mistakenly assumed he was discharged and stopped reporting to work. The supervisor Dan was on his way to speak to the claimant on Monday November 6 when both he and Ms. Ferrell learned that the claimant had not reported for his work shifts on November 2, 3 or 4. The claimant was considered to be a voluntary quit by the employer at that point.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of November 5, 2017.

The employer did participate personally in the fact-finding interview through Jerri Ferrell, who provided essentially the same information to the fact-finder as was provided at the appeal hearing.

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 section 96.5(2)a provides:

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:

a. The disqualification shall continue 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 Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) provides:

(7) Excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. The term “absenteeism” also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as “tardiness.” An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

The claimant had very poor attendance and had been warned that additional absences could lead to his discharge. Absences related to illness are generally considered excused, if they are **properly reported**. The claimant’s absence on November 1 was not properly reported as he called only twenty minutes prior to the start time of his shift. An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant’s history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

Additionally, the administrative law judge notes that in this case under these circumstances the claimant could be considered to have voluntarily quit his employment without good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

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:

a. The disqualification shall continue 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(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual’s wage credits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual’s employer, if so found by the department.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). The claimant has the burden of proving that the voluntary leaving was for good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code § 96.6(2) (amended 1998). Generally, when an individual mistakenly believes they are discharged from employment, but was not told so by the employer, and they discontinue reporting for work, the separation is considered a quit without good cause attributable to the employer.

Since claimant did not follow up with management personnel and his assumption of having been fired on November 2 was erroneous, claimant's failure to continue reporting to work was an abandonment of his job. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a-b, 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) (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 unrebutted 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.

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 if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer participated in the fact-finding interview

the claimant is obligated to repay the benefits he received to the agency and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The November 17, 2017, (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$900.00 and he is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and their account shall not be charged.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/rvs