

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

RENEE M FAUL
Claimant

APPEAL 18A-UI-03805-LJ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HENRY COUNTY SOLDIERS AND SAILORS
Employer

**OC: 02/25/18
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the March 15, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged for performing unsatisfactory work and not for disqualifying misconduct. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 19, 2018. The claimant, Renee Faul, participated through documentation. The employer, Henry County Soldiers and Sailors, participated through Lynn Humphreys, Human Resources Director; and Charlie Hammel, Director of Revenue Cycles. Claimant's written statement, marked as Exhibit A, and Employer's Exhibits 1 through 12 was received and admitted into the record without objection. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can 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, most recently as a patient access clerk, from September 8, 2014, until February 27, 2018, when she was discharged for an intentional HIPAA violation. On February 14, claimant was working alongside co-worker Tenley in the employer's Physical Therapy unit. While they were working, there was an overhead page for a rapid response to the emergency room. Claimant pulled up a screen on the employer's computer system to determine the identity of the patient needing a rapid response. She said this name aloud to Tenley, commented that this patient was a "frequent flier," and shared the claimant's medical issues with Tenley. Claimant was familiar with the patient and the patient's medical diagnosis from her work in the ER. Claimant had no legitimate work purpose to look up the patient's identity or share it with her co-worker. The following day, Tenley reported this incident to

Hammel. Tenley indicated that this was not the first time claimant had shared such information with her. According to Tenley, claimant had told her things about patients that made Tenley uncomfortable to know.

After Hammel learned about this incident, she conducted an access audit. Hammel confirmed that claimant had looked at the employer's census board, which is how she knew the name of the patient the day prior. Claimant looked at the census board approximately two minutes after the rapid response page had played. Hammel confirmed that claimant had not accessed the patient's chart or looked up any other information about the patient. Hammel determined claimant had no reason to look at the census board that day and concluded claimant's access of the census board went beyond the minimal amount of information she needed in order to perform her job, which is all that HIPAA permits. Hammel also reviewed the scenario with Patrick Waters, the former privacy officer, to ensure her judgment was correct. Hammel then reported the incident to Humphreys as a HIPAA violation. Hammel's investigation concluded on February 20, 2018.

On February 21, 2018, claimant was suspended for three days pending her termination. The employer explained that this is its standard procedure. It suspends an employee pending discharge and offers a three-day "cooling off" period for the employee to appeal the impending discharge or compile new or additional information that could prevent the discharge. Claimant was brought back in on February 27, and she had no additional information to present that would affect the outcome. Therefore, she was discharged.

As a healthcare provider, the employer and all of its employees are required to follow HIPAA. Claimant completed HIPAA training during her orientation. (Exhibit 1) Additionally, she completed annual HIPAA training to refresh her knowledge with education. (Exhibits 4 and 5) Claimant had received a warning in the past for an unintentional HIPAA violation. In December 2017, claimant failed to confirm a patient's address and as a result, his medical bill was sent to the wrong address. The employer explained that this did not result in claimant's discharge because it was a mere oversight and was not an intentional HIPAA violation.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,915.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of February 25, 2018, for the eight weeks ending April 14, 2018. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview. Both Humphreys and Hammel participated in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge finds the employer's testimony credible. The employer presented reasonable, consistent testimony supported by numerous exhibits. Claimant opted not to participate personally in the hearing and chose instead to submit a written statement. This statement was less credible than the employer's testimony.

In this case, claimant was discharged for an intentional HIPAA violation. The employer has established that claimant had training on HIPAA and knew she was not permitted to access any more information than was necessary to perform her job. On February 14, while claimant was

working in the Physical Therapy unit, she had absolutely no need to know the identity of any patient admitted to the emergency room or the hospital. The employer has established that claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. Iowa Code § 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 she 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), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The March 15, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,915.00 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/scn