

**IOWA DEPARTMENT OF INSPECTIOSN AND APPEALS
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION, UI APPEALS BUREAU**

DOMINIC I ARZAPALO
Claimant

APPEAL 22A-UI-16080-DZ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

VONACHEN SERVICES INC
Employer

**OC: 07/10/22
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer Participation in Fact-Finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Vonachen Services Inc, the employer/appellant, filed an appeal from the Iowa Workforce Development's (IWD) August 4, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance (UI) decision that allowed benefits because of a non-disqualifying April 29, 2022 discharge from work. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 13, 2022. The employer participated through John O'Fallon, UC Advantage hearing representative, Mike Reece, facility manager, and Julie Stephens, regional human resources manager. Mr. Arzapalo participated personally. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Did the employer discharge Mr. Arzapalo from employment for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

Was he overpaid benefits?

If so, should he repay the benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Mr. Arzapalo began working for the employer on November 4, 2021. He worked as a full-time general laborer in the employer's customer's (John Deere) factory. His employment ended on April 28, 2022.

The employer's harassment policy prohibits harassment, provides that employees should not make other feel uncomfortable, and directs employees to be polite to others. Mr. Arzapalo received a copy of the policy on, or about, his hire date.

On March 9, 2022, the John Deere reported to the employer that an employee had filed a sexual harassment complaint against Mr. Arzapalo because Mr. Arzapalo made the employee uncomfortable when he told the employee that she was pretty, asked her what her job was, and

asked her if she was single. John Deere requested that Mr. Arzapalo be transferred to a different work location. The employer obliged and moved Mr. Arzapalo to a different work location. The employer also gave Mr. Arzapalo a verbal warning and reminded him of the employer's harassment policy.

On March 29, the employer received multiple complaints from female employees at the new location at which Mr. Arzapalo worked. The complainants alleged that Mr. Arzapalo was inappropriate, pushy, and made them feel uncomfortable by staring at them and being in their personal space. In response, Mr. Arzapalo told the employer that he was just being nice, and he did not think he was making anyone feel uncomfortable. The employer gave Mr. Arzapalo another verbal warning and reminded him again of the employer's harassment policy. Mr. Reece spoke with Mr. Arzapalo and told Mr. Arzapalo to tone it down and keep things professional with female employees.

On April 28, a female employee reported that Mr. Arzapalo was stalking her by watching her from the parking lot and asking her to go on a date with him. In response to the complaint Mr. Arzapalo told the employer that he did not know what the complainant was talking about. The employer asked Mr. Arzapalo why someone would make up such a story about him. Mr. Arzapalo replied that it was because he was so "fucking handsome." The employer suspended Mr. Arzapalo on April 28 and later that day terminated his employment for a repeated pattern of violating the employer's harassment policy.

Mr. Arzapalo testified in the hearing that on April 28 he had told a female co-worker that she had a cute hat. Mr. Arzapalo further testified that he and the female co-worker spoke with each other sometimes, and he would make eye contact with her, but not watch her in a stalker-y way, because they worked in the same work area. Mr. Arzapalo testified that he has a strong personality, and he can be sexual at time. Mr. Arzapalo further testified that in these instances he was just being casual, and the employer took things out of proportion.

Mr. Arzapalo has received \$4,450.00 in REGULAR unemployment insurance (UI) benefits between July 10, 2022 and September 17, 2022. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the employer discharged Mr. Arzapalo from employment for job-related misconduct.

On June 16, 2022, Governor Reynolds signed into law House File 2355, which among other things, amended Iowa Code 96.5(2) to redefine misconduct and to list specific acts that constitute misconduct. The bill did not include an effective date and so it took effect on July 1, 2022. See Iowa Const. art. III, § 26; Iowa Code § 3.7(1).

There is a strong presumption in U.S. jurisprudence against legislation being applied retroactively. "The principle that the legal effect of conduct should ordinarily be assessed under the law that existed when the conduct took place has timeless and universal human appeal." *Kaiser Aluminum & Chem. Corp. v. Bonjorno*, 494 U.S. 827, 855 (1990) (Scalia, J. concurring). This is in part because "elementary considerations of fairness dictate that individuals should have an opportunity to know what the law is and to conform their conduct accordingly...." *Landgraf v. USI Film Prod.*, 511 U.S. 244, 265 (1994).

It would be fundamentally unfair and inconsistent with widely accepted legal principles to apply the amended Iowa Code 96.5(2) to the conduct at issue in this matter, which occurred before HF 2355 went into effect on July 1, 2022. As such, the amended Iowa Code 96.5(2) effective July 1, 2022 should not be applied to the conduct at issue here, and instead Iowa Code 96.5(2) as it existed at the time of the conduct will be applied.

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.

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 Iowa Supreme Court has held that this definition accurately reflects 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating the claimant from 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 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).

The employer is entitled to establish reasonable work rules and expect employees to abide by them. The employer has presented credible evidence that Mr. Arzapalo violated the employer's harassment policy after having been warned. Despite these warnings, Mr. Arzapalo continued to engage in similar behavior. This is disqualifying misconduct. Benefits are denied.

The administrative law judge further concludes as follows:

Iowa Code §96.3(7) provides, in pertinent part:

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.

(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.

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 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.

Mr. Arzapalo has been overpaid REGULAR (state) UI benefits in the gross amount of \$4,450.00. Mr. Arzapalo has been overpaid REGULAR (state) UI benefits because he is not qualified and/or ineligible to receive such benefits. Since the employer participated in the fact-finding interview, Mr. Arzapalo is required to repay the \$4,450.00.

DECISION:

The August 4, 2022 (reference 01) UI decision is REVERSED. The employer discharged Mr. Arzapalo from employment for job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Mr. Arzapalo has been overpaid REGULAR (state) UI benefits in the gross amount of \$4,450.00. Since the employer participated in the fact-finding interview, Mr. Arzapalo is required to repay these benefits.



Daniel Zeno
Administrative Law Judge

October 11, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

mh

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with this 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.

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 then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files 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 Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

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.

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 nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de **presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito** dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

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.