

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

CHELSEA J COMER
Claimant

KINSETH HOTEL CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 19A-UI-10211-SC-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 11/24/19
Claimant: Respondent (2)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On December 23, 2019, Kinseth Hotel Corporation (employer) filed an appeal from the December 13, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Chelsea J. Comer (claimant) was not discharged for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 21, 2020. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Heather Raver, General Manager, and Sharmell Davidson, Food and Beverage Worker, and it was represented by Diana Perry-Lehr. The Employer's Exhibits 1 through 4 and the Department's Exhibit D1 were admitted into the record without objection.

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 and the employer's account charged?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a Front Desk Night Supervisor beginning on May 30, 2018, and was separated from employment on November 7, 2019, when she was discharged. The employer has policies which prohibit non-working staff members from entering the back of house and all staff members from using the laundry facilities for personal use. The claimant was responsible for supervising the employees who worked during her shift. The only employee who usually worked with her was Sharmell Davidson, Food and Beverage Worker.

On November 7, Heather Raver, General Manager, reviewed the employer's surveillance footage from the night before. She observed Ryan Comer (Comer), the claimant's husband and one of the employer's maintenance employees, enter the employer's facilities. He was there to bring dinner for the claimant and was not scheduled to work. He entered the back of house area and, with the claimant's knowledge, used the employer's laundry facilities to dry his shirt. The claimant then allowed Comer to clock in for work even though he was not scheduled.

Raver observed Comer spend most of the hour and a half he was clocked in sitting in the office near the front desk. The claimant was discharged for theft of the employer's time and services.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,813.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of November 24, 2019, for the seven weeks ending January 11, 2020. Coral Erickson, Claims Specialist from Employers Unity LLC, participated in the fact-finding on behalf of the employer. The employer also submitted written documents including the claimant's separation notice.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

1. Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 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 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.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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, 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). Negligence does not constitute 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).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how the disputed factual issues were resolved. After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, the reliability of the evidence submitted, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using her own common sense and experience, the administrative law judge attributes more weight to the employer's version of events.

The employer has met the burden of proof to establish that the claimant engaged in willful or deliberate misconduct. The employer has an interest in protecting its assets and ensuring employees are working when being paid, which is part of the reason they hire supervisors. The claimant allowed an employee who was not scheduled to work to clock in without verifying he was actually working and to use the employer's facilities for personal use. The claimant's conduct is a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests and a deliberate disregard of the reasonable conduct an employer has a right to expect from a supervisor. The claimant's conduct is disqualifying without prior warning. Benefits are denied.

II. Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived and the employer's account charged?

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge finds the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits which must be repaid because the employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

Payment – determination – duration – child support intercept.

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.

(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.

(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(1) 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which she was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law 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. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). 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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10(1). The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The employer provided information through statements and documents that, without rebuttal, would have resulted in disqualification. Since the employer participated in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits she received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The December 13, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,813.00 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview and its account shall not be charged.



Stephanie R. Callahan
Administrative Law Judge

January 22, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn