# IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

**ASHLEY M HENRY** 

Claimant

**APPEAL 23A-UI-08586-DB-T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**WALMART INC** 

Employer

OC: 08/13/23

Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Overpayment of Benefits

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 - Employer Participation in Fact-finding Interview

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer/appellant filed an appeal from the September 1, 2023 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed unemployment insurance benefits to the claimant based upon a discharge from work. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 28, 2023. The claimant did not participate. The employer participated through witness Heather Weber. Employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted. The administrative law judge took administrative notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records, including the fact-finding documents. The claimant telephoned into the toll-free hearing number after the record was closed and was informed that a decision would be mailed to her.

# **ISSUES:**

Was the claimant's separation from employment disqualifying? Was the claimant overpaid benefits? Can the repayment of any benefits to the agency be waived? Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?

# FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant worked as a full-time front end service representative. Her last day physically worked on the job was in May or June of 2023. She was discharged from employment on August 8, 2023, for absenteeism.

Claimant was scheduled to work on July 28, 2023; August 5, 2023, and August 6, 2023. She was not on any approved leave of absence from work and her most recent request for leave of absence for dates in June and July of 2023 had been denied. Claimant did not call or notify the employer that she would be absent from her scheduled work shifts. According to the employer's written policy, three no call no shows resulted in nine occurrence points under the employer's absenteeism policy. According to the absenteeism policy, five or more occurrences can subject

an employee to termination. Claimant received a copy of the absenteeism policy. Claimant was discharged from work due to absenteeism on August 8, 2023.

Claimant's administrative records establish that she filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective August 13, 2023. She has filed weekly continued claims for benefits from August 13, 2023, through September 16, 2023 and received \$1,955.00 in benefits to date. Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) conducted a fact-finding interview on August 30, 2023. A person named Kevin participated on behalf of the employer in that phone interview. Claimant also participated in the phone interview. During the fact-finding interview, the employer provided the agency with information that the claimant reported her final absence from work to the employer stating that she was ill and that her final absence was on August 5, 2023.

The issue of whether the claimant has been able to and available for full-time work has not been adjudicated by IWD. That issue will be remanded to the Benefits Bureau for an initial investigation and determination.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes as follows:

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a & d provide in pertinent part:

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 the 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 obligation to the employer. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following: ...
- (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.

• • •

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job-related misconduct.<sup>1</sup> In unemployment insurance benefits cases, the issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982).

benefits.<sup>2</sup> What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions.<sup>3</sup> Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits.<sup>4</sup> Such misconduct must be "substantial."<sup>5</sup>

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) provides:

(7) Excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct **except for illness or other reasonable grounds** for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer. The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. Second, the absences must be unexcused. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways.

An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds". Or, because it was not "properly reported." Excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." 12

The term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping is not considered excused. Absences due to illness or injury must be properly reported in order to be excused. Absences in good faith, for good cause, with

<sup>6</sup> Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) (emphasis added); see *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (Iowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Pierce v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 425 N.W.2d 679 (lowa Ct. App. 1988).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Newman v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv., 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984).

<sup>5</sup> Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd., 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Higgins, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (lowa 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Cosper, 321 N.W.2d at 10 (lowa 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191 (lowa 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> *Id.* and *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10 (lowa 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Cosper, 321 N.W.2d at 10 (lowa 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 190 (lowa 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> *Id*. at 191.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10-11 (lowa 1982).

appropriate notice, are not misconduct.<sup>16</sup> They may be grounds for discharge but not for disqualification of benefits because substantial disregard for the employer's interest is not shown and this is essential to a finding of misconduct.<sup>17</sup> Excessive absenteeism has been found when there have been seven unexcused absences in five months; five unexcused absences and three instances of tardiness in eight months; three unexcused absences over an eight-month period; three unexcused absences over seven months; and missing three times after being warned.<sup>18</sup>

In this case, the claimant's final unexcused absences on July 28, 2023, August 5, 2023, and August 6, 2023, were excessive. This behavior is substantial and rises to the level of jobrelated misconduct. The separation from employment is disgualifying and benefits are denied.

The next issue is whether the claimant is overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits and whether the employer's account can be charged for benefits paid due to participation in the fact-finding interview.

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a-b provide:

- 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) (a) 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 employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers. If the department determines that an employer's failure to respond timely or adequately was due to insufficient notification from the department, the employer's account shall not be charged for the overpayment.
- (b) 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> *Id*. at 10.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> See Higgins, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (Iowa 1984); Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 321 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984); Armel v. EAB, 2007 WL 3376929\*3 (Iowa App. Nov. 15, 2007); Hiland v. EAB, No. 12-2300 (Iowa App. July 10, 2013); and Clark v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982).

(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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

- (1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.
- (2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.
- (3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to lowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid after the separation from employment which she was not entitled to. 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.<sup>19</sup>

In this case, the employer's witness at the fact-finding interview and its documentation sent to the agency stated that the claimant properly reported her last absence and that her last absence was August 5, 2023. Given this information, the administrative law judge finds that the employer did not sufficiently participate in the fact-finding interview by submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. While the employer's information provided to the fact-finding interviewer may have been incorrect, the information provided would not have led to a decision denying benefits. It is the employer's responsibility to provide correct information to the interviewer during the fact-finding interview, even if the employer chooses to use a third-party representative. Therefore, the employer's account may be charged for benefits paid and the claimant is not required to repay the State of lowa funded unemployment insurance benefits she received following the disqualifying separation from employment.

# **DECISION:**

The September 1, 2023 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for substantial job-related misconduct on August 8, 2023. Unemployment insurance benefits are denied until the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount after the August 8, 2023 separation date, and provided she is otherwise eligible.

The employer did not sufficiently participate in the fact-finding interview and therefore its account may be charged for benefits paid. The claimant is not required to repay the benefits she received after this disqualifying separation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Iowa Code § 96.3(7).

# **REMAND:**

The issue of whether the claimant has been able to and available for full-time work effective her original claim date of August 13, 2023 will be remanded to the Benefits Bureau for an initial investigation and determination.

Dawn Boucher

September 29, 2023
Decision Dated and Mailed

Administrative Law Judge

db/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 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 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. There is no filing fee to file an appeal with the Employment Appeal Board.

## 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 file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If you do not file 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 <a href="https://www.iowacourts.gov/efile">www.iowacourts.gov/efile</a>. There may be a filing fee to file the petition in District Court.

**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 4th Floor – Lucas Building Des Moines, Iowa 50319 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. No hay tarifa de presentación para presentar una apelación ante la Junta de Apelación de Empleo.

## 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 no presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelación de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en una acción final de la agencia y tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en www.iowacourts.gov/efile. Puede haber una tarifa de presentación para presentar la petición en el Tribunal de Distrito.

**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.