

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DEIGHE B WIGINGTON
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 06A-UI-08427-DT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

AMERISTAR CASINO COUNCIL BLUFFS
Employer

OC: 07/16/06 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (2)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Ameristar Casino Council Bluffs, Inc. (employer) appealed a representative's August 17, 2006 decision (reference 02) that concluded Deighe B. Wigington (claimant) was qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on September 7, 2006. The claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and provide a telephone number at which she could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing. Michelle Igney of TALX Employer Services appeared on the employer's behalf and presented testimony from two witnesses, Shila Kinsley and Ryan Stovic. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the employer, 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 work-connected misconduct? Was the claimant overpaid unemployment insurance benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on February 23, 2004. She worked full time as a cage cashier on a swing shift at the employer's Council Bluffs, Iowa casino. Her last day of work was July 15, 2006. The employer discharged her on that date. The stated reason for the discharge was excessive variances within a short period of time following prior warnings.

The employer imposes discipline on cashiers for having gross variances of \$100.00 or more in a month period; both positive and negative variances are included without offset. The claimant had received several prior warnings regarding variances, including one in November 2005 and a final written warning given on January 18, 2006. In addition, the claimant received a corrective action plan on March 7, 2006, in which she was retrained on procedures to prevent variances, including following a three-count rule, including multiple verbalizations.

The claimant went many months without having noted variances. However, on July 4, 2006 she had a variance of \$198.00, on July 13, 2006 she had a variance of \$80.00, and on July 14, 2006 she had

another variance of \$80.00. When Mr. Stovic, the cage manager, discussed the variances with the claimant, she had no explanation. Mr. Stovic believed that the claimant had become distracted due to non-work issues and had become careless.

The claimant established a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective July 16, 2006. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits after the separation from employment in the amount of \$1,848.00.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982); Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

The focus of the definition of misconduct is on acts or omissions by a claimant that "rise to the level of being deliberate, intentional or culpable." Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The acts must show:

1. Willful and wanton disregard of an employer's interest, such as found in:
 - a. Deliberate violation of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of its employees, or
 - b. Deliberate disregard of standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of its employees; or
2. Carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to:

- a. Manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design; or
- b. Show an intentional and substantial disregard of:
 1. The employer's interest, or
 2. The employee's duties and obligations to the employer.

The claimant had previously demonstrated she had the ability to perform the job without excessive variances. Sellers v. Employment Appeal Board, 531 N.W.2d 645 (Iowa App. 1995). The claimant's multiple excessive variances within a short period of time with no justifiable excuse after receiving prior warnings shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer discharged the claimant for reasons amounting to work-connected misconduct.

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.

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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The representative's August 17, 2006 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The employer discharged the claimant for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as of July 15, 2006. This disqualification continues until the claimant has been paid ten times her weekly benefit amount for insured work, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account will not be charged. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,848.00.

Lynette A. F. Donner
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/kjw