IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ALEXIS R HART

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-01453-MT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE AMENDED DECISION

LABOR READY MIDWEST INC

Employer

OC: 12/30/07 R: 03 Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated January 29, 2008, reference 08, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on February 26, 2008. Employer participated by Angie Wheelock, Operations Specialist. Claimant responded to the hearing notice and did not participate as he did not answer the telephone number provided.

ISSUES:

The issues in this matter are whether claimant was discharged for misconduct and is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for the employer November 14, 2007.

Employer suspended claimant on November 14, 2007 because claimant was 30 minutes late for work. Claimant was suspended for 30 days. Claimant had been coming to work late for some time. Claimant was warned on November 13, 2007 that if he came in late again he would be suspended for 30 days. Claimant failed to return from the suspension and ask for his job back.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated the employer's policy concerning tardiness. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant violated a known company rule after a final warning. Claimant was fully aware that he would receive a significant suspension if he did not arrive in work on time. Instead claimant, the very next day, came in late. Therefore, claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

The next issue concerns an overpayment of unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. 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.

Page 3 Appeal No. 08A-UI-01453-MT AMENDED

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 administrative law judge holds that claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$682.00 pursuant to lowa Code section 96.3-7 because a decision has determined the claimant to be ineligible to receive benefits due to a discharge for misconduct. Since claimant has been disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits, the claim shall be locked until claimant has re-qualified or is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated January 29, 2008, reference 08, is reversed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. Claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$682.00.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/css/kjw