

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

MIKE J HEADLEE  
103 MINNESOTA ST  
GLIDDEN IA 51443

PELLA CORPORATION  
c/o SHEAKLEY UNISERVICE INC  
PO BOX 1160  
COLUMBUS OH 43216-1160

JULIE MAYHALL  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
801 ADAMS ST  
CARROLL IA 51401

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-08679-S2T  
OC: 07/24/05 R: 01  
Claimant: Respondent (2)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party request the Appeals Section to reopen the record at the address listed at the top of this decision or 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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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:

Pella Corporation (employer) appealed a representative's August 15, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded Mike Headlee (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 September 8, 2005. The claimant was represented by Julie Mayhall, Attorney at Law, and participated personally. The employer was represented by Richard Carter, Hearings Representative, and participated by Jeff Heuton, Human Resources Manager; Nick Schultes, Department Manager; Marcy Puck, Human Resources Representative; and Trevor Reece, Production Manager. The claimant offered one exhibit which was marked for identification as Exhibit A. Exhibit A was received into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on June 16, 1997, as a full-time forklift driver. The employer gave the claimant training with regard to reporting accidents. The claimant knew the employer's policy with regard to reporting accidents. The claimant received five written warnings for failure to follow instructions and carelessness in his job performance. The claimant's quality of work was at times poor, he did not take care of broken glass and he was found sleeping on the job. The claimant did receive some good evaluations. The claimant could perform well so long as he follow instructions and was not careless.

On July 11, 2005, the claimant was working a shift that was short a forklift driver. The claimant had an accident with his forklift and damaged machinery. Rather than telephoning and reporting the incident to the employer, the claimant telephoned a maintenance person. The damage was discovered the following morning when the next shift arrived and could not work because the claimant did not report the damage in a timely manner. The employer terminated the claimant on July 14, 2005.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he 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). 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. Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by carelessly damaging machinery and negligently failing to follow instructions in reporting the damage immediately. The claimant had been careless in the past and received warnings for his failure to follow instructions. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, he 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 \$1,830.00 since filing his claim herein. Pursuant to this decision, those benefits now constitute an overpayment which must be repaid.

DECISION:

The representative's August 15, 2005 decision (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 has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,830.00.

bas/kjw