

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**HENRY A SEGOVIA**  
Claimant

**IOWA PREMIUM LLC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 20A-UI-11907-CL-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 06/28/20**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview  
PL 116-136, Sec. 2104(b) – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

On September 25, 2020, the employer filed an appeal from the September 23, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on December 22, 2020. Claimant did not register for the hearing and did not participate. Employer participated through manager Maria Hackenmiller.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?  
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?  
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?  
Is the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC)?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on July 30, 2019. Claimant last worked as a full-time maintenance employee. Claimant was separated from employment on June 29, 2020, when he was terminated.

Employer has a policy that prohibits sleeping on the job. Claimant received a copy of the policy.

At the end of his employment, two people reported witnessing claimant leaning against a tool box and sleeping on the job. When confronted, claimant explained that he had a migraine headache and he was leaning up against the tool box with his eyes closed. Claimant stated that he had been prescribed medication for migraines, but had not taken it for work because it would negatively affect his work.

Employer had never previously disciplined claimant for similar conduct.

Employer terminated claimant's employment.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a provides:

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 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 claimant was discharged for job-related misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The question is not whether the employer made the correct decision in ending claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). Misconduct justifying termination of an employee and misconduct warranting denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two different things. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.*

Negligence is not 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

In this case, claimant was terminated after resting his eyes on the job. Employer did not present firsthand witnesses and did not identify the individuals who reported claimant was sleeping. Therefore, the administrative law judge finds claimant's statement denying that he was sleeping and merely resting his eyes when he did not feel well more credible.

In this case, claimant should have reported he was not feeling well and went home. But this was an isolated error in judgment. Claimant had never been previously disciplined for sleeping or resting his eyes on the job. Employer failed to establish claimant was terminated for job related misconduct.

Claimant is qualified to receive regular unemployment insurance benefits and is therefore also eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. Claimant has not been overpaid benefits.

**DECISION:**

The September 23, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was separated for no disqualifying reason. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.



---

Christine A. Louis  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax (515)478-3528

January 7, 2021  
Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/scn