IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

DARIN SCHUKNECHT

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-06167-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

DECISION

VERMEER MANUFACTURING CO INC

Employer

OC: 01/18/09

Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Vermeer Manufacturing Company, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated April 17, 2009, reference 01, which held that Darin Schuknecht (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 18, 2009. The claimant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which he could be contacted, and therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Laura Briggs, Human Resources Business Partner. Employer's Exhibits One through Three were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired full-time on August 15, 2005 and worked as an intern for the first couple years of employment. At some point in 2008, the claimant became the manager for international credit and dealer finance and worked in this capacity until he was discharged on March 26, 2009. The employer has a third-party vendor called Ethics Point which employees can use to file complaints or concerns. It was reported that the claimant was excessively using the company Internet for personal use. His manager met with him on March 10, 2009 and directed him to correct this problem. The claimant simply said, "Ok" without offering any information. The manager also received a complaint that the claimant was using the employer's FedEx system for personal use and diverting the charges to a corporate account.

An investigation was conducted and the allegations were confirmed. The employer's investigation confirmed the claimant had made personal shipping charges on a corporate

account in the amount of \$752.78 from December 2008 through March 29, 2009. He was evidently publishing a book through Amazon and when someone bought the book, he would ship them out using the Employer's FedEx system. It was only through the claimant's work position that he had the authorization to divert the expenses to a corporate account. The employer met with the claimant on March 24, 2009 and he admitted using the FedEx system for personal use, admitted diverting the costs to a corporate account, and admitted he had no intentions of paying for those charges. The claimant signed a payroll deduction form to allow the employer to withhold \$752.78 from his final paycheck. The employer suspended the claimant on March 24, 2009 and discharged him on March 26, 2009.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective January 18, 2009 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for repeated theft. He admitted he had been using the employer's FedEx packaging system for personal use and diverted those charges to a corporate account with no intentions of paying for his personal charges. The claimant's conduct shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

lowa Code § 96.3(7) 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. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See lowa Code § 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received could constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated April 17, 2009, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

Susan D Ackerman Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	

Page 4 Appeal No. 09A-UI-06167-BT