

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**WENDY L MASSEY**  
Claimant

**IMMANUEL**  
Employer

**APPEAL 20A-UI-06008-AW-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**  
**DECISION**

**OC: 04/05/20**  
**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 June 1, 2020 (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on July 15, 2020, at 11:00 a.m. Claimant participated with her attorney Nathaniel Staudt. Employer participated through Thomas Kuiper, Hearing Representative, and Danielle Richardson, Human Resources Business Partner. Claimant's Exhibits A – D were admitted. Employer's Exhibits 1 – 9 were 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 Universal Care Attendant from December 17, 2019 until her employment with Immanuel ended on April 22, 2020. Claimant worked Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. Claimant's direct supervisor was Shawna Benedict, Assisted Living Manager.

Claimant sustained an injury while at work on March 16, 2020 and sought medical treatment. On April 17, 2020, employer contacted claimant regarding her work restrictions. Claimant reported that her restrictions were no lifting greater than 10 pounds, no bending and no twisting. Claimant confirmed that she did not have restrictions prohibiting her from walking, sitting or standing. Employer determined it could accommodate claimant's restrictions. Benedict

contacted claimant later the same day to discuss claimant's return to work. The parties agreed that claimant would return to work on April 20, 2020.

On April 20, 2020, claimant notified employer that she could not return to work because she had restrictions prohibiting her from sitting or standing. Employer requested a copy of claimant's restrictions. On April 21, 2020 or April 22, 2020, claimant sent a picture of her Patient Status Report from her physician to employer. (Exhibit 3) The picture that claimant sent had restrictions for lifting, bending, twisting and sitting. (Exhibit 3) In the picture that claimant sent, the markings for the sitting restriction looked different than the markings for the other restrictions. (Exhibit 3) Employer became suspicious that the document had been altered and requested a copy of the Patient Status Report directly from the physician. On April 22, 2020, the physician faxed employer the report which indicated claimant had lifting bending and twisting restrictions. (Exhibit 4 – 5) The report employer obtained from the physician did not indicate claimant had a sitting restriction. (Exhibit 5)

On April 22, 2020, employer confronted claimant about the discrepancies between the report claimant submitted to employer and the report employer received from the physician. Claimant stated that the discrepancy was due to claimant's report being a carbon copy and the markings being a carbon imprint on her copy. Employer discharged claimant on April 22, 2020 for dishonesty based upon claimant's statements to employer and the report claimant provided to employer.

The administrative record reflects that claimant filed for and has received regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits in the gross amount of \$3,498.00 for the 12-week period between April 19, 2020 and July 11, 2020. In addition to regular unemployment insurance benefits, claimant also received Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) in the gross amount of \$7,200.00 for the 12-week period between April 19, 2020 and July 11, 2020. Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, because it did not receive notice of the interview.

#### **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 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:

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 of misconduct 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). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). 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).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge, as the trier of fact, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other evidence you believe; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how I have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. I assessed the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using my own common sense and experience. I find employer's version of events to be more credible than claimant's version. Claimant was non-responsive and evasive. For example, when asked about a discrepancy in her testimony, claimant provided the address of a doctor's office that she had visited. Claimant's testimony was also internally inconsistent, specifically in regards to whether employer requested a copy of her restrictions and whether claimant provided employer with a copy. Claimant was also argumentative. Claimant's assertion that the markings on the restriction for sitting were caused by a carbon imprint on her copy of the patient status report is not credible. The administrative law judge finds it unlikely that the carbon imprint would perfectly mark the box beside and circle the word "sitting." Further, the carbon imprint is not visible on the patient copy that claimant admitted as Exhibits B and C.

Claimant told employer that her restrictions had changed and, thus, she could not return to work. Claimant then provided employer with a copy of an altered patient status report that supported her statements. Claimant's actions were dishonest. An employer can reasonably expect honesty from its employees without a formal policy or prior warning. Claimant's dishonesty constitutes a willful or wanton disregard for employer's interests and a deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior employer had a right to expect of her. Claimant's dishonesty was substantial misconduct. Employer discharged claimant for disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid UI, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer's account will be charged. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was overpaid UI, claimant is not required to repay UI and employer's account will not be charged.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(a)-(b) 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.

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), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which claimant was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid UI in the gross amount of \$3,498.00 for the 12-week period between April 19, 2020 and July 11, 2020. There is no evidence that claimant received these benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation. Furthermore, employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Therefore, claimant is not obligated to repay the UI benefits that she received. While employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, it was not because employer failed to timely or adequately respond to IWD's request for information relating to the payment of benefits; employer never received the request. Accordingly employer's account cannot be charged. Because neither party is to be charged, the UI overpayment is absorbed by the fund.

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.

PL 116-136, 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...

Because claimant is disqualified from receiving UI, she is also disqualified from receiving FPUC. While Iowa law does not require a claimant to repay regular unemployment insurance benefits when the employer does not participate in the fact-finding interview, the CARES Act makes no such exception for the repayment of FPUC. Therefore, the determination of whether the claimant must repay FPUC does not hinge on the employer's participation in the fact-finding interview. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC in the gross amount of \$7,200.00 for the 12-week period between April 19, 2020 and July 11, 2020. Claimant must repay these benefits.

*Note to Claimant:* This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations, but who are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>. If this decision becomes final or if you are not eligible for PUA, you may have an overpayment of benefits.

**DECISION:**

The June 1, 2020 (reference 03) 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 her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. Claimant has been overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits in the gross amount of \$3,498.00 for the 12-week period between April 19, 2020 and July 11, 2020 and is not obligated to repay those benefits to the agency. Employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview through no fault of its own; employer's account shall not be charged. The regular unemployment insurance benefit overpayment must be charged to the fund. Claimant has been overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in the gross amount of \$7,200.00 for the 12-week period between April 19, 2020 and July 11, 2020, which must be repaid.



---

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

July 28, 2020  
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/mh