

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**EDWARD E JACKSON**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-06859-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**GREYSTONE MANUFACTURING LLC**

Employer

**OC: 04-05-09**

**Claimant: Respondent (2R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the April 29, 2009, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on May 29, 2009. The claimant did not participate. The employer did participate through (representative) Marilyn Crawford, Office Manager/Human Resources Director and Nate Aukee, Production Manager. Employer's Exhibit One was received.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for work-related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed the testimony and all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a supervisor full time beginning January 10, 2008 through April 8, 2009 when he was discharged.

On or about April 4, 2009 the claimant grabbed the penis of an employee who worked for him. Later during same shift the claimant stood behind the same employee, pressed his belly up to the employee's back and held a sharp metal scrapper up to his head. Later that week the employee complained about the claimant's behavior to Mr. Aukee who had him report to the human resources department to fill out a complaint form.

On April 9 Mr. Aukee and Ms. Crawford interviewed the claimant about the employee's allegations. The claimant admitted to grabbing the employee's penis and to holding a scrapper to his head while standing behind him. The claimant admitted that his actions were wrong and a violation of the employer's sexual harassment policy which he had received and been trained on. The claimant then walked out of the meeting after being told that the company had a zero-tolerance policy for sexual harassment. The claimant was discharged for touching an employee who worked for him in violation of the employer's sexual harassment policy.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of April 5, 2009.

### **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.

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.

871 IAC 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.

The claimant knew or should have known that grabbing the penis of an employee who worked for him and holding a sharp metal scrapper to that same employee's head was conduct not in conformance with the employer's policies and was conduct not in the employer's best interest. His admitted conduct constitutes disqualifying misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.3-7, 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) 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. 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. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant 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 whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The matter of determining whether the overpayment should be recovered under Iowa Code § 96.3(7)b is remanded to the Agency.

#### **DECISION:**

The April 29, 2009, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has

worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,580.00.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/css