# IOWA DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION, UI APPEALS BUREAU

**JUAN C ROMAN DIAZ** 

Claimant

**APPEAL 22A-UI-18360-SC-T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**COUNCIL BLUFFS PAYROLL COMPANY** 

Employer

OC: 09/25/22

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

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On October 27, 2022, Council Bluffs Payroll Company (employer) filed an appeal from the October 17, 2022, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Juan C. Roman Diaz (claimant) was not discharged for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing held by telephone on November 16, 2022. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. The employer participated through Lisa Ensine, HR Generalist, and it was represented by Jackie Boudreax. The employer's proposed documents were not admitted into the record, because they had not been provided to the claimant. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, specifically the fact-finding documents and the claimant's claim history.

# **ISSUES:**

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 and charged to the employer's account?

### **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a Forklift Driver beginning on August 18, 2020, and was separated from employment on August 26, 2022, when they were discharged. The employer has an anti-violence policy that states if an employee engages in workplace violence, they will be discharged. The claimant knew about the employer's policy.

On August 24, 2022, the claimant and another employee were arguing about who was going to use a particular forklift. The claimant then punched the other employee in the chest, which left a red mark. The other employee notified management and Human Resources. An investigation was conducted, and witnesses confirmed the other employee's version of events, not the claimant's version in which they stated they were provoked. The claimant was discharged for violation of the anti-violence policy.

The administrative record reflects that the claimant has received \$1,872.00 in regular unemployment benefits, since filing a claim with an effective date of September 25, 2022, for the three weeks between October 9 and October 29, 2022. Tyler Reynolds, Unemployment Insurance Consultant with the employer's third-party representative, participated in the fact-finding on behalf of the employer. They provided information about the specific incident that led to the claimant's separation. There is no indication the workforce advisor requested to speak with a first-hand witness.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

I. Did the employer discharge the claimant for job related misconduct?

For the following reasons, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

lowa Code section 96.5(2) provides, in relevant part:

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.

. . .

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "misconduct" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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 even 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

. . .

(6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.

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.

The Iowa Supreme Court has held this definition accurately reflects the intent of the legislature.<sup>1</sup> The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct.<sup>2</sup> The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits.<sup>3</sup>

Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct.<sup>6</sup>

The employer has met the burden of proof to establish that the claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. The employer has a duty to protect and a substantial interest in protecting the safety of its employees. The employer's unrefuted evidence is that the claimant physically assaulted a coworker. The claimant's conduct was contrary to the best interests of the employer and the safety of their coworker, and is disqualifying misconduct, even without prior warning. Benefits are denied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Huntoon v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (lowa 1979).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Newman v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Henry v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co., 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990).

II. Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived and charged to the employer's account?

For the following reasons, the administrative law judge finds, the claimant was overpaid regular unemployment insurance benefits, which they are required to repay, because the employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

lowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

Payment – determination – duration – child support intercept.

- 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. If the department determines that an employer's failure to respond timely or adequately was due to insufficient notification from the department, the employer's account shall not be charged for the overpayment.
- (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(1) 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 lowa 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.

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 they were 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, an overpayment, which results from a reversal of an initial allowance of benefits based on a separation, will not be recovered 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.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits, but they were not eligible for those benefits. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview through their third-party representative.

8 Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Iowa Code § 96.3(7).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

Since the employer participated in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits they received, and the employer's account shall not be charged.

## **DECISION:**

The October 17, 2022, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is REVERSED. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as they have worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times their weekly benefit amount, provided they are otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid \$1,872.00 in regular unemployment insurance benefits, and they are obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

Stephanie R. Callahan Administrative Law Judge

Supranie R Can

<u>December 7, 2022</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

src/mh

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

#### AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <a href="https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf">https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf</a> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <a href="https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/">https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/</a>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

**Note to Claimant:** It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

## **SERVICE INFORMATION:**

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

Employment Appeal Board 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

#### UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https:///www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

**Nota para el reclamante:** es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

## SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.