

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JESSICA L HALL
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-07985-E2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MURPHY OIL USA INC
Employer

**Original Claim: 04/05/09
Claimant: Respondent (2/R)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated May 18, 2009, reference 01, which held the claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on June 18, 2009. The employer participated by Janet Green. The claimant did not answer the phone when called at the scheduled hearing time. The claimant called in late and stated that she missed the call due to the fact she had driven to Ohio yesterday because her grandmother was ill and that she was exhausted and did not hear the phone. This was deemed to be good cause to reopen the hearing. Both parties agreed to hold the hearing at 3:15 p.m. on June 18, 2009. Two attempts were made to contact the claimant, but she did not pick up her phone. The decision is based upon the evidence and testimony of the hearing conducted at 8:00 a.m. on June 18, 2009. Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence. The claimant called at 3:30 and wanted to have the hearing. Her phone was out of range, according to her. Her request to reopen the hearing was denied.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant last worked for employer on April 11, 2009. She was discharged on that date for her failure to follow the instructions of her supervisor, Janet Green. Ms. Green had left the claimant a detailed set of instructions on April 10, 2009. The claimant told her supervisor she did not want complete those tasks, so she did not do them. The claimant told a new coworker that they did not need to complete the items on the list. The claimant had received warnings about following instructions and procedures. She failed to properly complete fuel surveys on March 3, 2009 and failed to inventory cigarettes on March 16, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

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.

871 IAC 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 gravity of the incident, number of policy violations, and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer discharges her for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a. The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to willful wrongdoing or

repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

For unemployment insurance purposes, misconduct amounts to a deliberate act and a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of a worker's contract of employment. Misconduct is a deliberate violation or disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has a right to expect from employees or is an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, unsatisfactory performance due to inability or incapacity, inadvertence or ordinary negligence in isolated incidents, or good-faith errors in judgment or discretion are not deemed to constitute work-connected misconduct. 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a).

The claimant deliberately decided not to follow instructions given to her by her supervisor. She had been warned in the recent past about follow instructions. In this matter, the evidence established that the claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when she violated employer's policy concerning following instructions. The claimant was warned concerning about her behavior.

Iowa Code section 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.

The claims section shall determine the amount of the overpayment and if the claimant is required to repay the overpayment.

DECISION:

The representative's decision dated May 18, 2009, reference 01, is reversed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claims section shall determine the amount of the overpayment and if the claimant is required to repay the overpayment.

James Elliott
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jfe/kjw