

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DANIEL W WRICE
Claimant

KEVIN MCCAIN
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-05100-JP-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 04/16/17
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 May 4, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 1, 2017. Claimant participated. Employer participated through payroll/human resources assistant Laura Roney. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted into the record with no objection. Official notice was taken of the administrative record, including claimant's benefit payment history and wage history, with no objection.

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 as a forklift driver from October 6, 2016, and was separated from employment on March 18, 2017, when he was discharged.

The employer has a written policy that three consecutive work days of no-call/no-shows is considered a voluntary quit. The employer also has an attendance policy that applies point values to attendance infractions, including absences, tardies, and leaving early, regardless of reason for the infraction. The policy also provides that an employee will be warned as points are accumulated, and will be discharged upon receiving twelve points in a rolling twelve month period. The employer requires employees contact the employer and report their absence at least an hour prior to the start of their shift. Claimant was aware of the policies.

The final absences that led to discharge occurred on March 16 and 17, 2017. On March 16, 2017, claimant was a no-call/no-show for work. The employer did not attempt to contact

claimant. On March 17, 2017, claimant was absent from his scheduled shift. On March 17, 2017, a female contacted the employer's call-in line and left a message that claimant was in jail and would not be at work on March 17, 2017. The message did not reference March 16, 2017. Claimant was in jail because he had been arrested for driving while barred. Claimant was aware that his license was barred, but he had a valid work permit; however, when he was arrested he was outside of his range for work. On March 18, 2017, claimant called his supervisor Jon. Prior to calling Jon, claimant had bonded out of jail. Claimant asked Jon if he still had a job, because he knew he was at the end of his points and one more absence would result in him being discharged. The employer had previously warned claimant about his points. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant called Jon to see if he had been discharged because lives an hour away from the employer and he did not want to drive there if the employer had discharged him. Jon told claimant he had been pointed out (discharged). Claimant stopped reporting to work after Jon told him he had been discharged. Since claimant's arrest for driving while barred, he has pled guilty.

Claimant was last warned on March 9, 2017, that he faced termination from employment upon another incident of unexcused absenteeism. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant was suspended for three days on March 9, 2017. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant was issued a written warning for his attendance infractions on December 16, 2016. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant was given a verbal warning on November 28, 2016. Employer Exhibit 1. Claimant was also absent on: November 7, 2016 (sick), November 8, 2016 (sick), November 11, 2016 (left early), November 21, 2016 (overslept), November 22, 2016 (tardy), November 28, 2016 (tardy), November 29, 2016 (tardy), November 30, 2016 (tardy), December 14, 2016 (sick, doctor's note), December 15, 2016 (sick, doctor's note), and February 2, 2017 (no-call/no-show), and March 8, 2017 (no-call/no-show). Employer Exhibit 1.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,190.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of April 16, 2017, for the five weeks ending May 20, 2017. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Ms. Roney testified that she was aware of the fact-finding interview, but she missed the phone call. The only documentation the employer provided for the fact-finding interview was its statement of protest.

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. Benefits are denied.

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.

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).

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.

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). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). In the context of disqualification for unemployment benefits based on misconduct, the question is whether the employee engaged in a "deliberate act or omission," 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 conduct with "carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability." See Iowa Admin. Code r. 871 – 24.32(1)(a). Further, 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. See Iowa Admin. Code r. 871 – 24.32(7). However, excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6, 10 (Iowa 1982). For example, absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute work-connected misconduct since they are not volitional, even if the employer was fully within its rights to assess points or impose discipline up to or including discharge for the absence under its attendance policy. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 743 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007). 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

Excessive absenteeism has been found when there has been seven unexcused absences in five months; five unexcused absences and three instances of tardiness in eight months; three

unexcused absences over an eight-month period; three unexcused absences over seven months; and missing three times after being warned. See *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (Iowa 1984); *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984); *Armell v. EAB*, 2007 WL 3376929*3 (Iowa App. Nov. 15, 2007); *Hiland v. EAB*, No. 12-2300 (Iowa App. July 10, 2013); and *Clark v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982). Excessiveness by its definition implies an amount or degree too great to be reasonable or acceptable. Two absences would be the minimum amount in order to determine whether these repeated acts were excessive. Further, in the cases of absenteeism it is the law, not the employer's attendance policies, which determines whether absences are excused or unexcused. *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 743 N.W.2d 554, 557-58 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007).

Disqualifying conduct cannot be predicated on a mere arrest unsupported by a conviction or other credible evidence of the claimant's intentional conduct. *Irving v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 883 N.W.2d 179 (Iowa 2016)(citing *In re Benjamin*, 572 N.Y.S.2d 970, 972 (App. Div. 1991)(per curiam)). Claimant was arrested and charged with driving while barred. Claimant testified he was aware his license was barred and he has since pled guilty; thus, there was evidence presented that claimant engaged in the activities leading to his arrest.

An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits; however, an employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified as to when and why the employee is unable to report to work. Claimant was arrested for driving while barred, which caused his final absence on March 17, 2017. Claimant testified he has since pled guilty. Because claimant was convicted and therefore engaged in the behavior that led to his incarceration the resulting absences due to claimant's arrest are volitional and constitute misconduct. The employer has established that claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and his final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

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 he 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 not participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall be charged.

DECISION:

The May 4, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,190.00 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Jeremy Peterson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jp/rvs