

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TAMMY J BARDON
Claimant

HILLCREST FAMILY SERVICES
Employer

APPEAL 19A-UI-00672-DB-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 12/30/18
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/appellant filed an appeal from the January 17, 2019 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon claimant's discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 7, 2019. The claimant participated personally. The employer, Hillcrest Family Services, participated through witnesses Daniel Nettie, Joey Crowley, Paula Paider-Licht, and Gina Gassman. Employer's Exhibits 1 – 6 were admitted. The administrative law judge took administrative notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records including the fact-finding documents.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can any 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 maternal health coordinator from October 24, 2016 until December 7, 2018 when she was discharged. Claimant's immediate supervisor was Gina Gassman. Claimant typically worked forty hours per week but then her hours changed a few months prior to her discharge to 32 ½ hours per week.

The employer alleged that the claimant logged onto her computer system using another employee's log on credentials on two separate occasions. Claimant denied logging onto the computer system using another employee's log on credentials. Other employees had access to the claimant's computer and used it on occasion.

Claimant has received \$970.00 in gross unemployment insurance benefits since filing her initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of December 30, 2018. Employer did participate in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

As a preliminary matter, the administrative law judge finds that the Claimant did not quit. Claimant was discharged from employment.

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).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate

the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *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).

Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *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).

Further, a claimant cannot be discharged for a past act of misconduct. The final incident leading to discharge must be a current act of misconduct.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The purpose of this rule is to assure that an employer does not save up acts of misconduct and spring them on an employee when an independent desire to terminate arises. For example, an employer may not convert a lay off into a termination for misconduct by relying on past acts. *Milligan v. EAB*, 802 N.W.2d 238 (Table)(Iowa App. June 15, 2011).

The decision in this case rests, at least in part, upon the credibility of the parties. 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.* I have carefully weighed the credibility of the witnesses and the reliability of the evidence considering the applicable factors listed above. I find that the claimant's testimony that she did not log on to her computer using another co-worker's log on credentials is credible.

The employer failed to provide sufficient evidence of any current act of misconduct. The other issues listed in the corrective action for discharge refer to other acts that occurred prior to the final incident and to which claimant had already received corrective action for in Exhibits 3-6. An employer cannot save up acts of misconduct and use them for purposes of discharge whenever it decides to do so.

The employer has failed to meet its burden of proof in establishing a current act of disqualifying job-related misconduct. As such, benefits are allowed. Because benefits are allowed, the issues of overpayment and chargeability are moot.

DECISION:

The January 17, 2019 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid.

Dawn Boucher
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

db/rvs