

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

ANDREW G JANSSEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 19A-UCX-00014-JE-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY
Employer

OC: 04/21/19
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 December 5, 2019, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on January 6, 2020. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing. Monica Young, Store Manager and Roberta Wilson, Assistant Store Manager, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

ISSUE:

Whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct as defined by Iowa law.

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 kitchen employee for Casey's from May 13, 2019 to November 6, 2019. He was discharged following several customer complaints about their food and his behavior in the store.

On June 15, 2019, the claimant received a written warning after several customers heard him using profanity and acting in an aggressive manner. The claimant stated he was not going to answer the phone and take orders for pizza and "if people wanted pizza they could go to Pizza Ranch." Additionally, he was not making pizza correctly as they were cold and the cheese was not melted among other issues revolving around the pizzas.

On October 3, 2019, the claimant received a written warning because on September 28, 2019, a customer ordered a taco pizza and the claimant stated it would be ready in 40 minutes but when the customer received it after that time it was cold and the ingredients were dumped in the middle of the pizza. The employer warned the claimant that if he continued to make substandard pizzas his employment would be terminated.

On October 20, 2019, the claimant repeatedly used profanity so loudly that it could be heard throughout the store. The claimant signed the warning.

The claimant worked during the November 1, 2019, weekend and the employer received several complaints about the claimant's attitude and the quality of the food he was making. The claimant was making pizza and submarine sandwiches but was dumping the pizza ingredients in the middle of the pizza instead of distributing them equally and was putting two slices of meat on a sub instead of the required five pieces of meat. The subs are supposed to have two slices of cheese but the claimant was not using any. Customers complained he was throwing product around the store and that the phone was not being answered. A customer heard the claimant tell a co-worker not to answer the phone.

The employer terminated the claimant's employment November 6, 2019, for failing to perform his job in a satisfactory manner despite being capable of doing so.

The claimant has claimed and received unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,788.00 for the four weeks ending November 9, 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 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). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Board*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

The claimant was aware of how to make pizzas and submarine sandwiches and that an important function of a business that offers carryout and delivery services is answering the phone. Despite that knowledge, however, the claimant chose not to do his job on several occasions even though the employer had warned him about his behavior. Under these circumstances, the administrative law judge must conclude the employer has met its burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct as that term is defined by Iowa law. Therefore, benefits must be 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 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.

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 the employer failed to participate in the fact finding interview, the claimant is not required to repay the overpayment and the employer remains subject to charge for the overpaid benefits.

DECISION:

The December 5, 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. The claimant is not required to repay the overpayment and the employer remains subject to charge for the overpaid benefits

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/scn