

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

SANDY L HEMPE
517 – 25TH ST
AMES IA 50010

USA STAFFING INC
LABOR WORLD OF IOWA
3921 NE 14TH ST
DES MOINES IA 50313

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-10238-S2T
OC: 08/15/04 R: 02
Claimant: Respondent (2)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

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.

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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

U.S.A. Staffing (employer) appealed a representative's September 9, 2004 decision (reference 01) that concluded Sandy Hempe (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on October 18, 2004. The claimant participated personally. Sarah Kuhnen, former employee, and Carolyn Stidwell, friend, also testified for the claimant. The employer participated by Jodi McGonigle, Director of Business Development.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on April 21, 2003, as a full-time employment consultant. The claimant received a copy of the employer's handbook and signed for its receipt on June 21, 2003 and January 19, 2004. The claimant received 12 hours of earned time off each month. On October 14, 2003, the claimant received a written warning and three-day suspension for inappropriate attitude and conduct. The Director of Business Development and the claimant had a personality conflict. The claimant felt the punishment for her behavior was too drastic for the offense. The Director repeatedly put the claimant in a bad light in front of her co-workers.

On June 1, 2004, the claimant attended a meeting in which the employer made clear that no time off would be granted to an employee who did not have earned time off to cover the absence. On July 21, 2004, the claimant submitted a request for time off to the employer. The claimant wanted to take August 5, 6 and 27, 2004, as time off. At the time of the request the claimant had 3.25 hours of earned time off. The employer returned the request to the claimant unapproved. The employer attached a note to the claimant indicating the claimant would be earning 12 hours of earned time off at the end of July 2004, and she should resubmit her request when she had more earned time off.

The claimant did not resubmit her request for time off to the employer. She did not appear for work on August 5 and 6, 2004, because she went to a family reunion. On August 7, 2004, the claimant appeared for work and the employer terminated her.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes she was.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). The claimant did not follow instructions in resubmitting her request for time off, in taking vacation when she did not have enough earned time off to cover that vacation, and for not appearing for work or notifying the employer of her absence for two working days. An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to follow instructions. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, she is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code Section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

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 claimant has received benefits in the amount of \$1,808.00 since filing her claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits now constitute an overpayment which must be repaid.

DECISION:

The representative's September 9, 2004 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount provided, she is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,808.00.

bas/b