

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ALBERT ICHELSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 08A-UI-02311-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MCKENZIE CHECK ADVANCE OF IA LLC
Employer

**OC: 02/03/08 R: 02
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

McKenzie Check Advance of Iowa, LLC (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 29, 2008, reference 01, which held that Albert Ichelson (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 24, 2008. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Carisa Driscoll, Divisional Director of Operations. Employer's Exhibits One and Two were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time center manager from December 18, 2006 through February 7, 2008. He was discharged for violating a final written warning issued on November 1, 2007. The claimant was previously warned about conducting private business on his personal laptop computer while clocked in for work. The final warning advised him that if he brought his laptop into the center again or conducted personal business while working, it would be grounds for immediate termination. The claimant felt his supervisor was harassing him but did not contact the claimant's supervisor or anyone else to complain about it. He believed he did not have to follow the rule of not bringing his laptop computer to work since the rule did not come from the corporate office and he did not believe his supervisor had the authority to create a rule just for him. He was discharged after the employer found his laptop in the back of the work facility on February 8, 2008.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective February 3, 2008 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. 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.

Iowa Code § 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 employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for violating his final written warning when he brought his personal computer to the work facility. Regardless of whether he believed the policy was fair, he was warned his job was in jeopardy and ignored that warning. The claimant's conduct 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. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 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 unemployment insurance decision dated February 29, 2008, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until 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 is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$2,119.00.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/pjs