

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

ROBERT D KENDALL
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 19A-UI-07602-JE-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CARE AMBULANCE LLC
Employer

OC: 08/25/19
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the September 18, 2019, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on October 17, 2019. The claimant participated in the hearing. Melissa Herbaugh, Base Manager; John Cockrell, Director of Operations; and Shelby Garcia-Patton, Human Resources Manager; participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer. Claimant's Exhibit A and Employer's Exhibits One through Five were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time paramedic for Care Ambulance from March 20, 2017 to August 30, 2019. He was discharged for professional incompetency and falsification of medical records.

Every base manager reviews all calls and Director of Operations John Cockrell reviews 10 percent. EMTs and paramedics perform peer reviews of three reports per month.

On August 27, 2019, the claimant was the primary caregiver to a patient and during a review of his report the employer found he falsified medical records. He indicated he conducted a blood glucose check but the employer could not find any evidence that he had done so on any of its machines. The claimant maintains he did the glucose check but stated he used the emergency room physician's numbers instead of his own. The claimant reported the patient's airway was partially blocked with blood but did not initiate suction. He reported the patient's respiration was labored and should have assisted but did not do so. He reported the patient had a GCS of 6 that dropped to 4 but did not attempt to place a breathing tube in the patient. The employer determined he should have started an IV in the patient but failed to do so. After reviewing the

claimant's report and questioning him and witnesses, the employer determined the claimant showed a lack of patient care any other paramedic would have completed.

On June 4, 2019, the claimant received a written warning after he documented a problem with a patient's airway but did not manage it.

On June 28, 2019, the claimant received a written warning for failing to write an accurate narrative after he stated a patient was transported by ambulance but did not provide any details of why that decision was made. The warning stated the claimant's documentation needed to improve.

On July 13, 2019, a care coordinator and physician from Iowa Methodist notified the employer they were reporting the claimant to the state for failing to follow a physician's order. The claimant's narrative stated the patient's pain was not under control on an ALS (advanced life support) call. Mr. Cockrell told the claimant it appeared to be "laziness and you turfed it off as BLS (basic life support)" (Employer's Exhibit One). The claimant drove the ambulance and left the patient in back with an EMT who could not administer pain medications per doctor's orders or attend an ALS patient. The patient was without pain medication for 58 minutes instead of receiving pain medication every 15 minutes as the doctor ordered. The doctor also wanted "a paramedic to attend and wanted (the patient's) pain managed" (Employer's Exhibit One). The claimant chose not to administer any paid medication as ordered. Mr. Cockrell notified the claimant that from that point on he would be auditing 100 percent of his case reports (Employer's Exhibit One).

On August 14, 2019, the claimant received a written warning for making inappropriate comments and using profanity about a base manager during a staff meeting.

The employer terminated the claimant's employment August 30, 2019, following the final incident on August 27, 2019.

The claimant has claimed and received unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,930.00 for the six weeks ending October 5, 2019.

The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying job misconduct.

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 proving disqualifying misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged him for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a. Misconduct that disqualifies an individual from receiving unemployment insurance benefits occurs when there are deliberate acts or omissions that constitute a material breach of the worker's duties and obligations to the employer. See 871 IAC 24.32(1).

The claimant failed to follow the standards of care expected of a paramedic on more than one occasion. The employer warned the claimant in writing three times about his care of patients and about his patient care reports between June 4 and July 13, 2019. Despite those warnings, and being told Mr. Cockrell was auditing 100 percent of his reports, the claimant still failed to follow accepted standards of care August 27, 2019. Rather than follow the accepted standards, the claimant seemingly substituted his judgment for that of higher ranking medical personnel and the accepted standards of care in violation of the employer's policy.

Under these circumstances, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's conduct demonstrated a willful disregard of the standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of employees and shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer has met its burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. IDJS*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Therefore, benefits are denied.

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.

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 section 96.3(7)a, b.

The claimant received benefits but has been denied benefits as a result of this decision. The claimant, therefore, was overpaid benefits.

Because the claimant did not receive benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation and employer failed to participate in the finding interview, the claimant is not required to repay the overpayment and the employer remains subject to charge for the overpaid benefits.

The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. Consequently, the claimant's overpayment of benefits is waived as to the claimant and his overpayment, in the amount of \$2,930.00 for the six weeks ending October 5, 2019, shall be charged to the employer's account.

DECISION:

The September 18, 2019, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to 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. The claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview within the meaning of the law. Therefore, the claimant's overpayment of benefits, in the amount of \$2,930.00 for the six weeks ending October 5, 2019, shall be charged to the employer's account.

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/scn