

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**JEANNIE L HURLEY**  
Claimant

**WALMART INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 19A-UI-02358-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 02/17/19**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment  
871 IAC 24.10 – Employer Participation in the fact-finding Interview

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed an appeal from the March 8, 2019, (reference 01) representative decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 23, 2019. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Emily Peterson, Store Manager. Employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted into the record. Official notice was taken of agency records.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged due to job connected 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 an assistant manager beginning on August 28, 2004 through February 13, 2019 when she was discharged for falsification of documents. As part of her regular duties the claimant was required to perform safety checks for all the power equipment at least once during her work shift. After making the safety checks she was required to accurately complete the check list indicating the time she performed the check and then to sign the checklist indicating it was accurate. Claimant had been given access to the employer's policies and knew that even one instance of falsification of records would lead to her discharge. Once per week another manager would review surveillance video to insure that the claimant had actually completed the safety check as required.

In December 2018 Heidi was responsible for reviewing the surveillance video. She was having a difficult time finding video showing that claimant and another manager were actually making

the safety checks at the time they indicated on the safety checklists. In late December 2018 Heidi sent an email to the claimant, Nathan, another assistant manager, and Ms. Peterson reminding them that they were required to be accurate when filling out the check list. Heidi told the claimant she was having difficulty finding video of the claimant performing the safety checks at the times she indicated on the check list.

On January 1 the claimant was observed on video correctly performing the required safety checks. Claimant accurately filled out and signed the required checklists. Claimant had demonstrated an ability to accurately complete the safety checklists.

On January 2, 8 and 9 Heidi reviewed surveillance video that showed at no time during her work shifts did claimant even go near the power lifting equipment. Claimant did complete the checklists for each of those shifts indicating she had performed the required safety checks. Claimant signed the checklists. Heidi brought to Ms. Peterson's attention what she had discovered when reviewing the surveillance video. Ms. Peterson investigated including reviewing all of the video herself. On January 23 Ms. Peterson met with the claimant. The claimant admitted she had not made the checks because she was too busy. Claimant should not have filled out the form indicating she had made the checks if she had not. Claimant was discharged for repeated falsification of safety documents. Claimant was not treated any differently than any other assistant manager in the same circumstances.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of February 17, 2019. The employer did not participate personally in the fact-finding interview but did submit detailed documents that establish the same information as was presented at the appeal hearing. The employer had sufficient participation 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 due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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 Company*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). Claimant as a manager knew that she was required to follow the employer's rules of conduct. It was reasonable for the employer to require a safety check of power equipment once during each work shift. It was reasonable for the employer to require the claimant to be honest and accurate when she filled out the safety checklist forms. Less than one month prior to the falsification of the safety documents the claimant was sent an e-mail reminding her that she was to accurately complete the safety check lists. Claimant falsified safety documents on January 2, 8 and 9. Her conduct was a violation of the employer's rules and procedures and is sufficient job connected misconduct to disqualify her from receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 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 unrebutted 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 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 if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer participated in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay the benefits she received to the agency and the employer's account shall not be charged.

#### **DECISION:**

The March 8, 2019, (reference 01) decision is reversed. The 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 \$2,008.00 and she is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview and their account shall not be charged.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/rvs