

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**MICHAEL P MCNULTY**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-00875-MT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**GREG'S LAWN SERVICE INC**  
Employer

**OC: 12/22/13  
Claimant: Respondent (2R)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits, Employer Chargeability for non-participation at Fact Finding

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated January 21, 2014, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on February 14, 2014. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Greg Scharf, President and CEO and Linda Simon, Office Manager. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

**ISSUES:**

The issues in this matter are whether claimant was discharged for misconduct and recovery of overpayment of unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on December 19, 2013.

Employer discharged claimant on December 19, 2013 because claimant refused to work on a Saturday and Sunday during a snow storm. Claimant told employer that he was not going to work that Saturday during a predicted snow storm. Employer warned claimant three times in one day about coming to work for the impending storm. Employer demands that all employees work during snow storms. Claimant had previously made arrangements for a weekend out of town to celebrate his 25th wedding anniversary. Employer gave claimant three chances to change his mind about working during the storm. Employer clearly informed claimant that if he did not work he would lose his job. The year prior employer had issued claimant a warning for the exact same thing.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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.

871 IAC 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.

871 IAC 24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

871 IAC 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa 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.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated the employer’s policy concerning insubordination. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge constitutes misconduct because claimant violated a known company rule after a final warning. The prior warning weighs heavily toward a finding that claimant acted intentionally when refusing to work. The three warning conferences prior to discharge also weigh heavily toward a finding of misconduct. Refusing to work is a blatant act of insubordination. Therefore, claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

The next issue concerns an overpayment of unemployment insurance benefits and charges to employer’s account.

Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment benefits. See 871 IAC 24.10(4).

Employer participation would include testimony from a firsthand witness or the name and number of a firsthand witness who may be contacted for rebuttal. It could also include a detailed written statement or documents that provide specific, factual information regarding the separation. At a minimum, the employer’s information regarding a discharge must include the dates, particular circumstances and the act or omissions of the claimant. A voluntary separation should include the stated reason for the quit. See 871 IAC 24.10(1)

Statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and/or information submitted after the fact-finding interview are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute. See 871 IAC 24.10(1)

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer’s account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code § 96.3-7-a, -b.

This matter is remanded to the claims section for determination of claimant’s overpayment.

Employer’s account shall not be charged because employer did meaningfully participate at fact finding. Employer’s version of the events as given at fact finding is sufficient to prevail had claimant not participated. As such employer’s account shall not be charged.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated January 21, 2014, reference 01, is reversed and remanded for determination of claimant's overpayment. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. Employer's account shall not be charged.

---

Marlon Mormann  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/pjs