

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

ROSE E ANDREWS
914 N 26TH ST
COUNCIL BLUFFS IA 51501

ARAMARK FHC LLC
C/o TALX UCM SERVICES
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-00288-HT
OC: 12/04/05 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (2)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5(2)a – Discharge
Section 96.3(7) – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Aramark, filed an appeal from a decision dated December 29, 2005, reference 01. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Rose Andrews. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on January 25, 2006. The claimant participated on her own behalf and with a witness Cindy Harmon. The employer participated by Food Service Director Deb Potter. Exhibits One, Two and Three were admitted into the record.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Rose Andrews was employed by Aramark from April 16, 2003 until November 30, 2005. She was a full-time cook.

From January 7 until November 30, 2005, the claimant received seven warnings regarding work performance, attendance, insubordination, and unauthorized overtime. Each warning notified her that discharge could occur for any further violations.

On Friday, November 25, 2005, Food Service Director Deb Potter received a note from a supervisor who had been on duty the day before. The claimant has been sleeping in the break room, which is acceptable, but she had exceeded her 15-minute break by 10 minutes, and had to be awakened by the supervisor to return to work. Sleeping on the job is a dischargeable offense in and of itself, but Ms. Potter reviewed the claimant's disciplinary history on Monday, November 28, 2005. She made the decision to discharge Ms. Andrews the next day, but the claimant called in sick. The employer notified her when she returned to work on November 30, 2005, that she was fired.

Rose Andrews has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of December 4, 2005.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant is disqualified. The judge concludes she is.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The claimant had been advised her job was in jeopardy as a result of her poor attendance, work performance and insubordination. The employer did not discharge her for any of the prior disciplinary issues but could not ignore a dischargeable offense such as sleeping on the job or exceeding allotted break time. The claimant was essentially being paid for time she should have been working at her assigned tasks but instead was sleeping. This is a violation of the duties and responsibilities an employer has the right to expect of an employee and is conduct not in the best interests of the employer. The claimant is disqualified.

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.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits to which she is not entitled. These must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The representative's decision of December 29, 2005, reference 01, is reversed. Rose Andrews is disqualified and benefits are withheld until she has earned ten times her weekly benefit, amount provided she is otherwise eligible. She is overpaid in the amount of \$1,484.00.

bgh/kjw