

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

JEFFREY B RODRIGUEZ
Claimant

INSIGHT PARTNERSHIP GROUP LLC
Employer

APPEAL 16A-UI-07759-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 06/12/16
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 July 5, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 3, 2016. Claimant did participate along with his witness Kathy Buck. Employer participated through Christina Watson, Program Director and (representative) Amy White, Chief Operating Officer. Employer's exhibit one was entered and received into the record.

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 a sight manager beginning on December 9, 2013 through June 15, 2016 when he was discharged.

The employer serves clients with mental health issues and intellectual learning disabilities. The employer is not certified by the state of Iowa to provide any type of work or vocational services to any client. Nor is the employer insured to provide any type of workers' compensation insurance for clients who engage in work.

On June 12 the claimant asked two of the clients if they wanted to make some money. One of the clients refused but the other agreed. The claimant drove the client out to Southeast Community College where they both helped a vendor who had been selling things at a flea

market load up a truck with the wares she had for sale. The claimant loaded boxes into a truck while the client put lids on boxes. At the end of the roughly two-hour period, the vendor paid the claimant twenty dollars and the client ten dollars. At the time the client and the claimant were providing services to the vendor, the claimant was on the clock getting paid by his employer Insight Partnership Group. The claimant could produce no proof that he had permission from his employer to obtain payment from anyone else while he was on the clock for the employer. When the employer learned of the claimant's actions on June 15 they immediately investigated and discharged the claimant.

The claimant had been given a copy of the employer's policies and procedures when hired which put him on notice that even one violation of the employer's ethical code could lead to his discharge.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of June 12, 2016.

The employer did participate personally in the fact-finding interview through Christina Watson and provided essentially the same information to the fact-finder that was provided at the appeal hearing.

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.

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).

The claimant's argument that he and the client were doing a "volunteer" project is not believable. The client reported to the employer that the claimant offered him work where he could make money. The client had no reason to provide any different information to the employer. The very nature of volunteer work is that no payment is received. While nominal, the claimant was paid as was the client. The employer's point that if it was a "volunteer" activity there was no reason for the claimant to be paid more money than that which was given to the client. Ms. Buck, the vendor, had no credible reason why she gave one "volunteer" more money than the other "volunteer." Her failure to explain that leads the administrative law judge to conclude the claimant was given more money because he did more work. Working for another entity/employer/contractor while getting paid by his full-time employer was conduct not in this employer's best interest. If the claimant had himself been hurt loading boxes, his employer's workers' compensation carrier would have been liable for the costs. The claimant's actions subject this employer to potential liability. An employer need not suffer actual harm from an action before they prohibit the conduct. That the claimant had a client working with him compounds the severity of the misconduct as the client could have suffered injury. The totality of the evidence establishes that the claimant committed substantial job connected misconduct sufficient to disqualify him from receipt of 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 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 he received to the agency and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The July 5, 2016, (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 has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,858.00 and he 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/pjs