IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

RYAN M ROTGERS Claimant

APPEAL 24A-UI-02481-ED-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

NIMROD MEATS LLC

Employer

OC: 01/28/24 Claimant: Respondent (2)

lowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(4) – VQ – Three no call-no show absences lowa Code § 96.3(7) – Overpayment lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 - Employer Chargeability

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer/appellant filed an appeal from the February 28, 2024 (reference 04) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A hearing was scheduled March 28, 2024. The parties requested a continuance and the hearing was re-scheduled for April 23, 2024. A telephone hearing was held on April 23, 2024. Claimant, Ryan Rotgers, participated. Employer, Nimrod Meats LLC, participated through Dominick Damiano. The employer and the claimant both updated their mailing address during the hearing. Employer's Exhibits 1 - 7 were offered and admitted into evidence. The claimant did not offer any exhibits. Official notice was taken of the claimant's administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant was discharged for disqualifying misconduct.

Whether claimant's separation was a voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer.

Whether the claimant overpaid benefits.

Whether the employer participated in the fact-finding process.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant began working for the employer on November 14, 2023 as a meat trimmer. He worked on a full-time basis. His immediate supervisor was Jesse Evanson. The claimant last worked for this employer on January 25, 2024 when he was discharged from employment.

The claimant was discharged due to insubordination in failing to follow directions and failure to perform his job duties.

On January 8, 2024, the claimant was tardy to work and left without permission before the end of his shift. On January 13, 2024 the claimant was absent from work due to his truck not starting.

The claimant would often become frustrated at work. On December 29, 2023, the claimant was frustrated and yelled at his supervisor. On January 8, 2024, January 9, 2024 and January 23, 2024, the claimant failed to follow the employer's procedure after having been reminded of the procedure, became upset and yelled at his supervisor. The claimant was warned that he may be discharged from employment if the issues continued.

The claimant was paid \$5,928.00 in regular state unemployment benefits since the filing effective date of January 28, 2024. The employer did participate in the fact-finding interview.

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. Benefits are denied.

lowa Code section 96.5(2)a and d provide:

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 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

(1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.

(2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.

(3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.

(4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.

(5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the

employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual if compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.

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

(7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that result in missing work.

(8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.

(10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.

(11) Failure to maintain any licenses, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.

(12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.

(13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

(14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The lowa Court of Appeals found substantial evidence of misconduct in testimony that the claimant worked slower than he was capable of working and would temporarily and briefly improve following oral reprimands. Sellers v. Emp't Appeal Bd., 531 N.W.2d 645 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co., 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Failure to sign a written reprimand acknowledging receipt constitutes job misconduct as a matter of law. Green v lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 299 N.W.2d 651 (Iowa 1980). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Newman v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). Willful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey a future reasonable instruction of his employer. Myers v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 373 N.W.2d 507 (lowa Ct. App. 1985). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disgualifying in nature. Id. Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disgualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. Henry v. lowa 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).

Disqualification for a single misconduct incident must be a deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which employer has a right to expect. *Diggs v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 478 N.W.2d 432 (lowa Ct. App. 1991).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, 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 believable evidence; 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 administrative law judge finds the employer's testimony with supporting documentation more credible than the claimant's testimony.

The employer has presented substantial and credible evidence that claimant became upset with his supervisor and yelled at the supervisor after he had failed to follow his employer's instructions on December 29, 2023, January 8, 2024, January 9, 2024 and January 23, 2024. Claimant's repeated failure to accurately perform his job duties after having been warned is evidence of carelessness to such a degree of recurrence as to rise to the level of disqualifying job related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she 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 those 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 did provide evidence that it participated in the fact-finding interview the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received in connection with this employer's account, and this employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The February 28, 2024, (reference 04) decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment due disqualifying 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 was overpaid benefits in the amount of \$5,928.00 and is required to repay those benefits. The employer's account shall not be charged.

Emily Drenkow Cam

Emily Drenkow Carr Administrative Law Judge

April 24, 2024 Decision Dated and Mailed

ed/scn

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 6200 Park Avenue, Suite 100 Des Moines, Iowa 50321 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 lowa Code §17A.19, which is online at https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court Lerk of Court Lerk of Court S.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

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 6200 Park Avenue, Suite 100 Des Moines, Iowa 50321 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.