

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DAVID M SANDERS
Claimant

WALMART INC.
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-10120-AW-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION

OC: 01/24/21
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
PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the March 22, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 24, 2021, at 2:00 p.m. Claimant did not participate. Employer participated through Tim Shane, Store Manager. Employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct.
Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.
Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.
Whether claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time Digital Personal Shopper until his employment with Walmart ended on January 29, 2021.

Employer has an Associate Pay Policy that prohibits falsification of time records and states that violation of the policy may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination. (Exhibit 1, pp. 14 – 18) Claimant was aware of the policy. (Exhibit 1, pp. 9, 12, 23)

Employer learned that claimant was modifying his time cards in an effort to be paid for time that he had not worked. When the issue came to employer's attention, employer suspended claimant pending an investigation. On January 27, 2021, employer interviewed claimant as a part of its investigation. Claimant admitted to falsifying his time card in order to receive compensation for hours that he had not worked. (Exhibit 1, pp. 21-22) On January 29, 2021, employer discharged claimant for time theft. (Exhibit 1, p. 24)

The administrative record reflects that claimant has not received unemployment insurance benefits, since filing his initial claim effective January 24, 2021.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged for disqualifying 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:

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. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, 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). 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). 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 Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

Reporting time on one's timecard when one is not working is theft from the employer. Theft from an employer is generally disqualifying misconduct. *Ringland Johnson, Inc. v. Hunecke*, 585 N.W.2d 269, 272 (Iowa 1998). In Ringland, the Court found a single attempted theft to be misconduct as a matter of law.

Claimant submitted a timecard reflecting that he should be paid for time that he did not work. Claimant's theft was contrary to the best interests of his employer. Claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Because no benefits were paid to claimant, the issues of overpayment, repayment and chargeability are moot. Because claimant is not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits, claimant is also not eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. See PL 116-136 §2104(B).

DECISION:

The March 22, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment and chargeability are moot. Claimant is not eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

June 28, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/scn