

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

AMANDA A WILSON
Claimant

CASEYS MARKETING COMPANY
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-11959-LJ-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 04/12/20
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge from Employment
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer Participation in Fact-Finding
PL 116-136, sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On April 29, 2021, the employer, Casey's Marketing Company, filed an appeal from the April 19, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged from employment and the employer failed to establish the discharge was for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephonic hearing was held at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, July 19, 2021. The claimant, Amanda A. Wilson, did not register a telephone number at which to be reached and did not participate in the hearing. The employer, Casey's Marketing Company, participated through Carina Solis, Store Manager. Employer's Exhibits E1 through E4 were received and admitted into the record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged from employment for disqualifying, job-related misconduct?
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?
Was the claimant overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time, most recently as a store employee, from November 8, 2016, until February 10, 2021, when she was discharged for violating company policy.

On February 2, 2021, claimant was working at the front registers. Solis watched camera footage from that date and observed claimant with her mask down, rather than properly worn over her nose and mouth, speaking with a coworker while guests were in the store. Claimant

had received a prior warning for failing to properly wear her mask while working. (Employer Exhibit E4) Claimant was notified that her job would be in jeopardy for future violations of this nature.

The employer maintains a written dress code policy. Incorporated within this written dress code is the employer's policy regarding proper mask usage. This policy states in relevant part: "A face mask is required, properly covering your nose and mouth and secured under the chin, while at work." Claimant was provided a copy of this policy. Additionally, the employer issued "multiple communications . . . to stores regarding the requirements for face masks." (Employer Exhibit E1) The employer added specific language regarding proper mask usage to its dress code to help protect employees and customers from COVID-19.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$2,282.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of April 12, 2020, and an additional date of February 7, 2021, for the seven weeks ending April 10, 2021. Claimant also received an additional \$300.00 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation ("FPUC") benefits for each of those seven weeks, totaling \$2,100.00. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview. Solis personally participated in the fact-finding interview by completing a written fact-finding questionnaire.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld.

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). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). 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).

Here, the employer has presented substantial and credible evidence that claimant was observed not wearing her mask while speaking with a coworker and while in the presence of customers. Claimant's conduct could have placed the health of everyone present in jeopardy. Claimant has previously been warned that not wearing a mask while working was unacceptable, and she had been formally notified that her job would be in jeopardy if she continued to not wear her mask while working. The administrative law judge finds claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld.

The next issue is whether claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b, 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) (a) 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. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) 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.

(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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in [871—subrule 24.32\(7\)](#). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous

pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she 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. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

The final issue is whether claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant was eligible for FPUC and whether claimant has been overpaid FPUC. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was not eligible for FPUC and was overpaid FPUC, which must be repaid.

PL116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

(A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus

(B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as "Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation").

....

(f) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...

Section 203 of the Continued Assistance for Unemployed Workers Act of 2020 provides in pertinent part:

(a) IN GENERAL. – Section 2104(e) of the CARES Act (15 U.S.C. 9023(e)) is amended to read as follows: . . .

“(e) APPLICABILITY. – An agreement entered into under this section shall apply –

(1) to weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into and ending on or before July 31, 2020; and

(2) to weeks of unemployment beginning after December 26, 2020 (or, if later, the date on which such agreement is entered into), and ending on or before March 14, 2021.”.

(b) AMOUNT.-

(1) IN GENERAL. – Section 2104(b) of the CARES Act (15 U.S.C. 9023(b)) is amended –

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “of \$600” and inserting “equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3)”; and

(B) by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

“(3) AMOUNT OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.-

“(A) IN GENERAL. – The amount specified in this paragraph is the following amount:

“(i) For weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which an agreement is entered into under this section and ending on or before July 31, 2020, \$600.

“(ii) For weeks of unemployment beginning after December 26, 2020 (or, if later, the date on which such agreement is entered into), and ending on or before March 14, 2021, \$300.”.

Because claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits, she is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$2,100.00 for the 7 weeks ending April 10, 2021. Claimant must repay these benefits.

DECISION:

The April 19, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,282.00 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

The claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in the gross amount of \$2,100.00 for the 7 weeks ending April 10, 2021. Claimant must repay these benefits.



Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

July 27, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/mh