# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**ROBERT G HESS** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-00817-H2

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**CITY OF AMES** 

Employer

OC: 12-12-10

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 January 10, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 28, 2011 at Des Moines, Iowa. The claimant did not participate. The employer did participate through Karen Jamison, Assistant Director of Operation for the Transit Department and was represented by Judy K. Parks, Attorney at Law. Employer's Exhibits One through 9(e) were entered and received into the record.

# **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 bus driver part time beginning May 14, 2010 through July 29, 2010 when he was discharged. While returning his bus to the bus garage on July 26, 2010 the claimant hit another bus damaging it and his own bus. When the employer reviewed the surveillance tapes and spoke to the claimant, they determined that the accident was preventable. The claimant could have asked others in the garage to spot for him, or could have asked for their assistance in getting his bus parked carefully. When the claimant was questioned about the accident, he refused to acknowledge that it was serious and indicated that all the buses had scrapes on them like he had put on the bus he was driving. Such was not the case as the employer at hearing presented the extent of the damage caused by the claimant. Since the claimant was such a new employee, and had undergone such extensive training and refused to acknowledge the seriousness of the accident he was discharged.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of December 12, 2010.

Appeal No. 11A-UI-00817-H2

#### **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 employer's evidence does establish that the claimant's accident was preventable and was due to his own negligence and carelessness. He had extensive training, help available if he had asked and was using his mirror but still hit another non-moving bus. His cavalier attitude about the damage indicates his refusal to take seriously the need to protect the employer's property. The preventable accident in conjunction with the claimant's attitude after the accident is evidence of willful job related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

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.

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 January 10, 2011 (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.

Page 4 Appeal No. 11A-UI-00817-H2

# **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)k	is remanded t	o the	Agency.	

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs