

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

NEAL A BOCKENSTEDT
Claimant

APPEAL 18A-UI-05713-LJ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

IOWA CATHOLIC CONFERENCE
Employer

**OC: 04/22/18
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

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 10, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged and the employer did not establish willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 11, 2018. The claimant, Neal A. Bockenstedt, participated. The employer, Iowa Catholic Conference, participated through Ellen Stemler, Principal; and Hearing Representative Paul Jahnke represented the employer.

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 part-time, most recently as a bus driver, from August 2017 until April 20, 2018, when he was discharged. The final incident leading to claimant's discharge occurred on April 16, 2018. That day, claimant was turning into a gas station at Douglas and 30th Street in Des Moines when he went over a curb. Claimant swung wide to try and miss the curb, but he ended up going over the curb anyway. One student banged his head into the side of the bus and suffered a bruised ear. Claimant got this student ice, and the following day he reported the incident to the employer. Stemler also interviewed several students who were on the bus and the injured student's mother to confirm what happened. Claimant had one prior warning for speeding. He was told that no further incidents could occur.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,588.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of April 22, 2018, for the six weeks ending June 2, 2018. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did

not participate in the fact-finding interview, make a first-hand witness available for rebuttal, or provide written documentation that, without rebuttal, would have resulted in disqualification. The employer had an emergency involving a student and was not able to participate in the hearing.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

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).

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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to

substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

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). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy. In this case, claimant was discharged for running over a curb, which caused injury to a child. Claimant provided unrefuted testimony that he tried to avoid the curb and it appears this was at most negligence on claimant's part. The employer has not established that claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying willful or deliberate misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. As claimant's separation is not disqualifying, the issues of overpayment, repayment, and chargeability are moot.

DECISION:

The May 10, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment, and chargeability are moot.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/scn