

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JOHN L RASMUSSEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-11715-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WESTAR FOODS INC
Employer

OC: 07-11-10
Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the August 12, 2010, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 7, 2010. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Scott Yates, Cook.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged due to job related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as an assistant manager full time beginning in July 24, 2007 through July 9, 2010 when he was discharged. The claimant was discharged after another employee, Scott Yates, reported to the employer that the claimant had physically attacked him. Mr. Yates and the claimant had argued about the claimant's ex-girlfriend. Mr. Yates was walking back to the restaurant after his break, when the claimant approached him and physically attacked him. The claimant instigated the physical attack. While the claimant was not on work time, he was a manager of the business and was expected to know that he could not physically assault anyone, let alone employees he supervised. The claimant sought out Mr. Yates. There was no reason for Mr. Yates, who was on the clock at the time, to out of the blue attack the claimant. The claimant had argued with his ex-girlfriend on the telephone earlier and the claimant specifically went looking for him.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for job-related misconduct.

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.

Where a claimant participated in a confrontation without attempt to retreat, the Iowa Court of Appeals rejected a self-defense argument stating that to establish such a defense the claimant must show freedom from fault in bringing on the encounter, a necessity to fight back, and an attempt to retreat unless there is no means of escape or that peril would increase by doing so. *Savage v. EAB*, 529 N.W.2d 640 (Iowa App. 1995).

Employers generally have an interest in protecting the safety of all of its employees and invitees.

Employer has an interest and duty in protecting the safety of all of its employees. Claimant's act of physical aggression was in violation of specific work rules and against commonly known acceptable standards of work behavior. This behavior was contrary to the best interests of employer and the safety of its employees and is disqualifying misconduct even without prior warning. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. 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.

b. (1) 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. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant 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 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 whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits.

REMAND:

The matter of determining the amount of the potential overpayment and whether the overpayment should be recovered under Iowa Code § 96.3(7)b is remanded to the Agency.

DECISION:

The August 12, 2010, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for reasons related to job misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as the claimant works in and has been paid for wages equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs