

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

**AMENDED**

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-04471-S2T  
OC: 03/26/06 R: 03  
Claimant: Respondent (2)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

REBECCA L WEARMOUTH  
812 – 3<sup>RD</sup> ST SE  
INDEPENDENCE IA 50644

UNITED STATES CELLULAR CORP  
c/o FRICK UC EXPRESS  
PO BOX 283  
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

KARLA SHEA  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
PO BOX 960  
WATERLOO IA 50704

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

United States Cellular (employer) appealed a representative's April 14, 2006 decision (reference 01) that concluded Rebecca Wearmouth (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 23, 2006. The claimant was represented by Karla Shea, Attorney at Law, and participated personally. Mark Merfeld, Customer, also testified for the claimant. The employer participated by Carrie Lalk, Sales Supervisor. Eric Conlon and Matt Murray observed the hearing.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on July 17, 2000, as a part-time retail wireless consultant. The claimant signed for receipt of the company handbook. In addition, she signed for the receipt of the Associate Phone Program Policy on November 29, 2005. The employer issued the claimant a written warning on November 30, 2005, for improperly accessing the account of a co-worker the day after she received the employer's policy regarding unauthorized accessing of accounts. The claimant wanted the cellular number of a co-worker and accessed the information on the computer. Afterwards the claimant realized her actions violated the policy. The employer warned the claimant that further infractions could result in her termination from employment.

On or about December 27, 2001, a customer did not want to go through the employer's call center to service his account. Instead he made the claimant an authorized user on his account. In November 2005, when the claimant signed for the receipt of the Associate Phone Program Policy, she did not consider the customer's situation even though the Policy indicates that "Associates cannot access, view, or process any type of transaction on their own associate account or revenue (consumer) accounts(s) that are in their name and liability". On March 24, 2006, the employer discovered the claimant had been accessing the customer's account from December 27, 2001, to February 27, 2006. The employer terminated the claimant on March 29, 2006.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons, the administrative law judge concludes she was.

Iowa Code section 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by acting negligently on two occasions. She was warned that further violations could result in her termination after she negligently accessed the account of a co-worker. The claimant disregarded the warning and carelessly continued to access an account which bore her name. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, she is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code section 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.

The claimant has received benefits in the amount of \$2,359.00 since filing her claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits now constitute an overpayment which must be repaid.

#### DECISION:

The representative's April 14, 2006 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,359.00.

bas/pjs/kjw