

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

JOHN KOLENO
Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-06278-JC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CORKERY TRANSPORT INC
Employer

OC: 05/03/20
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview
PL116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer/appellant, Corkery Transport Inc., filed an appeal from the June 11, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. After proper notice, a telephone hearing was conducted on July 21, 2020. The claimant did not respond to the notice of hearing to furnish a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate in the hearing. The employer participated through Ross Corkery.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

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?
Is the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation?

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 semi-driver, and was separated from employment on April 15, 2020, when he was discharged.

The final incident occurred on April 14, 2020, when the employer received a complaint regarding the claimant's parking of the employer truck in a church parking lot across the street from his home. The claimant had the option to park the employer truck at his home or at the yard/terminal. He had been previously told by the employer verbally not to park his truck at the

church lot, due to complaints. The truck-trailer weighed 80,000 pounds when loaded and the employer was aware that new concrete had been laid at the church. The employer did not want to be liable for repairs if the concrete was damaged. When questioned, the claimant said there was construction on the street near his home. He was subsequently discharged.

Prior to the final incident, the claimant had been issued several warnings, including speeding in the company truck (April 2, 2019, December 23, 2019, and January 27, 2020), for causing the truck to jack-knife while operating (May 30, 2019) and for having unauthorized passengers in his truck without completing the required paperwork (January 20, 2020 and March 21, 2020).

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$5,698.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of May 3, 2020.

The claimant also received federal unemployment insurance benefits through Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC). Claimant received \$6,600.00 in federal benefits for the eleven-week period ending July 18, 2020.

The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the June 10, 2020 fact-finding interview or make a witness with direct knowledge available for rebuttal. The incorrect phone number was listed on the fact-finding interview notice. The employer gave the correct number on the SIDES claim protest and also attempted to contact IWD to correct the phone number prior to the interview but received a busy signal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Iowa law disqualifies individuals who are discharged from employment for misconduct from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a. They remain disqualified until such time as they requalify for benefits by working and earning insured wages ten times their weekly benefit amount. *Id.*

Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.32(1)a provides:

“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).

In an at-will employment environment, an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 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. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa 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. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa 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 Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

The question of whether the refusal to perform a specific task constitutes misconduct must be determined by evaluating both the reasonableness of the employer’s request in light of all circumstances and the employee’s reason for noncompliance. *Endicott v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 367 N.W.2d 300 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985).

In this case, the claimant had a history of disregarding employer directives, and most recently before discharge, had been warned after having an unauthorized passenger in the employer truck for the second time. The claimant had also specifically been directed not to park the employer truck at a church adjacent to his home. The claimant was not required to park the employer truck at home, and could have used the provided employer terminal/yard. On April 14, 2020, the claimant parked an 80,000 pound truck-trailer in the parking lot, which prompted a complaint from the church. The weight of the vehicle could have caused damage to the church lot. There was no emergency or imminent harm which required the claimant to park the vehicle at the church lot, and he could have parked the trucked at the employer terminal/yard. The evidence presented does not support mitigating evidence that would justify his non-compliance with the employer directive. The administrative law judge is persuaded the claimant knew or should have known his conduct was contrary to the best interests of the employer. Therefore, based on the evidence presented, the claimant was discharged for misconduct, and benefits are denied.

Even though the claimant is not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits under state law, he/she may be eligible for federally funded unemployment insurance benefits under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (“Cares Act”), Public Law 116-136. Section 2102 of the CARES Act creates a new temporary federal program called Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) that in general provides up to 39 weeks of unemployment benefits. An individual receiving PUA benefits may also receive the \$600 weekly benefit amount (WBA) under the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) program if he or she is eligible for such compensation for the week claimed. The claimant must apply for PUA, as noted in the instructions provided in the “Note to Claimant” below.

The next issue to address is whether the claimant must repay the regular state benefits he received.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b 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 § 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 § 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.

(1) 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 states pursuant to § 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 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he was not entitled. The claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$5,698.00. 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. 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 it did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

The employer made a good faith effort to be available and participate in the fact-finding interview. When it recognized an incorrect number was listed on the fact-finding interview notice, it tried to reach IWD to update the number but received a busy signal. The employer also tried to provide correct information by way of the SIDES claim protest which allows contact information to be listed. Benefits were not allowed because the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to IWD's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. Instead, benefits were allowed because the employer could not reach IWD to update the contact information so it could participate in the fact-finding interview. Employer thus cannot be charged.

Since neither party is to be charged, any potential charges for this claim should be absorbed by the fund. Claimant **does not** have to repay the regular unemployment insurance benefits.

The final issue to address is whether the claimant is eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC).

PL116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

(A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus

(B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as "Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation").

....

(f) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...

Here, the claimant is disqualified from receiving regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits. Accordingly, this also disqualifies claimant from receiving Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC). In addition to the regular UI benefits claimant received, he also received an additional \$6,600.00 in FPUC benefits for the eleven-week period ending July 18, 2020. Claimant is required to repay those benefits.

DECISION:

The June 11, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for disqualifying 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 been overpaid \$5,698.00 in regular unemployment insurance benefits, but does not have to repay the benefits because the employer did not satisfactorily participate in the fact-finding interview. The employer's account is relieved of charges.

The claimant has also been overpaid \$6,600.00 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. The claimant may have to repay the benefits received thus far, unless the claimant applies and is approved for PUA, as directed in the paragraph below.

NOTE TO CLAIMANT:

- This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.
- If you do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations and are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19, you may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.** More information about how to apply for PUA is available online at:
www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information

If you have applied and have been approved for PUA benefits, this decision will not negatively affect your entitlement to PUA benefits.



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

July 30, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn