IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

CODY ELLIOTT

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-05413-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

DECISION

ADVANCED DRAINAGE SYSTEMS INC

Employer

OC: 03/25/12

Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated April 27, 2012, reference 01, which held that Cody Elliott (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 31, 2012. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Mitch Kirkland, Plant Manager and Duane Kingery, Dispatcher. Employer's Exhibits One and Two were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: Advanced Draining Systems manufactures and delivers water management products. Its facility is located in Eagle Grove, Iowa and they have approximately 90 employees, 20 of whom are drivers. The claimant was employed as a full-time fleet driver from March 29, 2010 through March 26, 2012. It is the responsibility of all drivers to deliver the product to the customers and to pick up the center cores, which are long pieces of tubular pipe up to six or seven feet long on which the product is carried.

The drivers typically work Mondays through Fridays but sometimes have to work on the weekend. If a driver does have to work the weekend, they are given a five-day notice. The claimant had to work on Saturday, March 24, 2012 and this was the first Saturday this year employees had to work. The claimant delivered product to a customer and oftentimes the customers will help pick up the center cores but this particular customer just watched the claimant work.

Shortly thereafter, the claimant called Dispatcher Duane Kingery and yelled at him. The claimant was angry about having to work on Saturday and was angry about having to load center cores alone. He said to Mr. Kingery, "You're not working today are you" and then he ended his call by stating, "Fuck you Duane." Mr. Kingery reported the claimant's call to Plant Manager Mitch Kirkland and Mr. Kirkland called the claimant to set up a meeting. The claimant refused to go to the work site to be fired so Mr. Kirkland told him over the phone that he was discharged for gross misconduct and lack of respect for his supervisor.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective March 25, 2012 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

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.

The employer has the burden to prove the discharged employee is disqualified for benefits for misconduct. *Sallis v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895, 896 (Iowa 1989). The claimant was discharged for insubordination on March 26, 2012 after he yelled at his supervisor and told

him, "fuck you." An employer has the right to expect decency and civility from its employees and an employee's use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct disqualifying the employee from receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Henecke v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 533 N.W.2d 573 (Iowa App. 1995). The claimant's insubordination shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

lowa Code § 96.3(7) 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. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See lowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated April 27, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until 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 matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

Susan D. Ackerman Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
sda/css	