

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

LESLIE A DESHERLIA
Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-10194-CL-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

PILOT TRAVEL CENTERS LLC
Employer

OC: 04/19/20
Claimant: Respondent (2R)

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(b) – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On August 21, 2020, the employer filed an appeal from the August 14, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 8, 2020. Claimant did not register for the hearing and did not participate. Employer participated through general manager Nathaniel Schultz.

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?
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?
Is the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on August 29, 2019. Claimant was separated from employment on November 22, 2019, when she was terminated.

Employer has a policy prohibiting theft from the company. Claimant was aware of the policy.

Employer sells lottery tickets. A previous general manager suspected there was something going on with the lottery tickets because the numbers were off. The general manager watched surveillance footage and observed claimant putting lottery tickets in her purse. The general manager confronted claimant. The general manager terminated claimant and claimant paid the money back that she took from the employer.

No agency records reflect whether employer participated in the fact finding interview. Employer is unaware of whether it participated in the fact finding interview.

Claimant has received a number of unemployment insurance benefits since this separation from employment, including pandemic unemployment insurance benefits, regular unemployment insurance benefits, and federal pandemic unemployment compensation.

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, 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 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.

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for job-related misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The question is not whether the employer made the correct decision in ending claimant's employment, 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). Misconduct justifying termination of an employee and misconduct warranting denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two different things. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Misconduct must be “substantial” to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a “wrongful intent” to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* Negligence is not misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer’s interests. *Henry v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

In this case, claimant stole lottery tickets from employer. Any reasonable person would expect to be terminated for this conduct. The conduct violated employer’s policy and the law. Employer established claimant was terminated for misconduct.

This matter will be remanded for a calculation of claimant’s overpayment of benefits as it involves multiple claim years and multiple types of benefits.

DECISION:

The August 14, 2020, (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 she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

REMAND:

This matter is remanded to the Benefits Bureau of Iowa Workforce Development for a calculation of claimant’s overpayment of benefits since her disqualifying separation from employment on November 22, 2019.



Christine A. Louis
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

October 12, 2020

Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/sam

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>.