BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

DORIAN C HARRISON	
Claimant	HEARING NUMBER: 17BUI-05339
and	EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
FOCUS SERVICES LLC	
Employer	

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a request for a REHEARING is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within 20 days of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-A

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds it cannot affirm the administrative law judge's decision. The Employment Appeal Board **REVERSES** as set forth below.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Claimant, Dorian C. Harrison, worked for Focus Services, LLC from 2013 through May 1, 2017 as a full-time customer services representative (CSR) at a call center. (4:09-4:34; 11:26) The Employer has a verbal policy that prohibits employees from accessing their own accounts or accounts of family or friends for any reason, which is presented during training at the time of hire. (12:15-12:47; 13:05-13:32) The Employer also has written policy that requires recordings for any account issue or adjustments. (13:51-14:09)

On April 26, 2017, Mr. Harrison issued a bill credit to his own personal account, which also belonged to his girlfriend (also an employee) without calling for prior authorization, and did so without recording the adjustment. (4:39-4:58; 10:47; 11:03-11:10; 11:42-11:12:04; 15:32-15:43) The Employer terminated the Claimant for violating its policies the following Monday.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) (2013) provides:

Discharge for Misconduct. If the department finds the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and been paid wages for the insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

The Division of Job Service defines misconduct at 871 IAC 24.32(1)(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 the 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.

The Iowa Supreme court has accepted this definition as reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Board*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665, (Iowa 2000) (quoting *Reigelsberger v. Employment Appeal Board*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Board*, 616 NW2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

The findings of fact show how we have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. We have carefully weighed the credibility of the witnesses and the reliability of the evidence. We attribute more weight to the Claimant's version of events. The Employer provided credible testimony that all employees are trained on its policies at the start of their employment. Although the Claimant denied that he knew his personal account adjustment was disallowed, we find his testimony not credible in light of the type of business in which the

Employer was engaged. In addition, his failure to record the adjustment left the Employer ignorant as to the nature of the adjustment and whether or not the adjustment was legitimate. It is reasonable and prudent for any business of this type to have such policies in place, lest any employee could potentially make changes that could unjustifiably inure to his or her financial benefit without any type of oversight. The Claimant's action certainly violated the standards of behavior that the Employer had a right to expect of its employees, and he knew or should have known that his action could jeopardize his employment. Based on this record, we conclude that the Employer satisfied its burden of proof.

DECISION:

The administrative law judge's decision dated July 6, 2017 is **REVERSED**. The Employment Appeal Board concludes that the Claimant was discharged for disqualifying misconduct. Accordingly, the Claimant is denied benefits until such time he has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. See, Iowa Code section 96.5(2)"a".

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

AMG/fnv

James M. Strohman