

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DUKE E PADILLA
Claimant

CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY
Employer

APPEAL 19A-UI-02109-DB-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 02/03/19
Claimant: Respondent (4)

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:

The employer/appellant filed an appeal from the March 1, 2019 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that found claimant was eligible for benefits based upon claimant's discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 26, 2019. The claimant, Duke E. Padilla, did not participate. The employer, Casey's Marketing Company, participated through witnesses Zontel McCann and Jennifer Martinez. Employer's Exhibits 1 and 2 were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can any charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

Claimant was employed full-time as kitchen worker from August 9, 2017 until February 1, 2019, when he was discharged from employment. Claimant's immediate supervisor was Jennifer Martinez.

This employer has a written policy against employees acting discourteous, using profanity, making threats of violence, or engaging in incidents of harassment or intimidation. See Exhibit 2. On February 1, 2019, claimant received a written warning for use of profane language and hostility in the workplace. See Exhibit 1. The written warning instructed him that he needed to act in accordance with the standards of professionalism set forth in the employer's written policy. See Exhibit 1. When he received the written warning from Ms. Martinez, he used profane language, ripped up the warning in front of a customer and co-workers, and proceeded

to throw a piece of machinery in the kitchen. Ms. Martinez discharged the claimant following this incident on February 1, 2019.

Claimant's administrative records establish that he received benefits of \$1,425.00 for the five weeks between February 17, 2019 and March 23, 2019. The employer only provided written documentation for the fact-finding interview, which did not include any information as to why the claimant was discharged from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

As a preliminary matter, I find that the Claimant did not quit. Claimant was discharged from employment.

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.

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. Iowa Code § 96.6(2); *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 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). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus of the administrative code definition of misconduct is on deliberate, intentional or culpable acts by the employee. *Id.* When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* 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).

Insubordination can manifest in several different ways. An employer has the right to expect an employee to follow reasonable directions. *Myers v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 373 N.W.2d 507 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). Willful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey a future reasonable instruction of his employer. *Id.* Misconduct can be found when a claimant was discharged for refusing to complete job tasks after his shift because he created the extra job tasks by working too slow. *Boyd v. Iowa Dept. of Job Serv.*, 377 N.W.2d 1 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). Continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990).

However, if the request was unreasonable or the claimant had a good faith belief or good cause to refuse the request, no misconduct would be found. *Woods v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 327 N.W.2d 768, 771 (Iowa Ct.App.1982)(an employee's failure to perform a specific task may not constitute misconduct if such failure is in good faith or for good cause). An instruction is reasonable if it presents no hardship to the employee and no threat to his or her health, safety, or morals. See *Endicott v. Iowa Dep't of Job Services*, 367 N.W.2d 300, 304 (Iowa App. 1985)(finding misconduct based on employee's unreasonable refusal to work overtime after employer's short-notice request).

In this case, clearly the instruction to act appropriately in the workplace, not use profane language, or engage in any conduct that was threatening or intimidating was reasonable given the fact that it presented no hardship to the claimant and no threat to his health, safety or morals. Claimant deliberately failed to follow his supervisor's instructions in violation of the employer's written policy and deliberately disregarded the employer's interests on February 1, 2019. This is clearly a deliberate act that constituted a material breach of his duties and obligations that arose out of his contract of employment. Accordingly, the employer has proven claimant committed job-related misconduct. As such, benefits are denied.

The next issue is whether the claimant must repay the benefits he has received since he is overpaid benefits. The administrative law judge finds that he does not have to repay the benefits that he has received.

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

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 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 un rebutted 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he 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 those benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. 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. 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).

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The employer provided written documentation to the fact-finding interview but did not state any reason why the claimant was discharged. Further, the employer's representative provided no information to the fact-finder during the fact-finding interview. This is not sufficient participation to relieve the employer of charges. Since the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received in connection with this employer's account and this employer's account shall be charged.

DECISION:

The March 1, 2019 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is modified in favor of the appellant. Claimant was discharged from employment for job-related misconduct. Unemployment insurance benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and earned wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount after his separation date, and provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, but is not obligated to repay the benefits because the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid.

Dawn Boucher
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

db/rvs