

- DECISION -

Claimant:
KENDRA S HANS

Decision No.: 4986-BR-12

Date: November 20, 2012

Appeal No.: 1218828

S.S. No.:

Employer:
RUSSELL INSURANCE GROUP

L.O. No.: 60

Appellant: Employer

Issue: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct or gross misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of Maryland Code, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 8-1002 or 1003.

- NOTICE OF RIGHT OF APPEAL TO COURT -

You may file an appeal from this decision in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City or one of the Circuit Courts in a county in Maryland. The court rules about how to file the appeal can be found in many public libraries, in the Maryland Rules of Procedure, Title 7, Chapter 200.

The period for filing an appeal expires: December 20, 2012

REVIEW OF THE RECORD

After a review of the record, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's findings of fact and conclusions of law.

The General Assembly declared that, in its considered judgment, the public good and the general welfare of the citizens of the State required the enactment of the Unemployment Insurance Law, under the police powers of the State, for the compulsory setting aside of unemployment reserves to be used for the benefit of individuals unemployed through no fault of their own. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., §8-102(c)*. Unemployment compensation laws are to be read liberally in favor of eligibility, and disqualification

provisions are to be strictly construed. *Sinai Hosp. of Baltimore v. Dept. of Empl. & Training*, 309 Md. 28 (1987).

The Board reviews the record *de novo* and may affirm, modify, or reverse the findings of fact or conclusions of law of the hearing examiner on the basis of evidence submitted to the hearing examiner, or evidence that the Board may direct to be taken, or may remand any case to a hearing examiner for purposes it may direct. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., §8-510(d)*; *COMAR 09.32.06.04*. The Board fully inquires into the facts of each particular case. *COMAR 09.32.06.03(E)(1)*.

In a discharge case, the employer has the burden of demonstrating that the claimant's actions rise to the level of misconduct, gross misconduct or aggravated misconduct based upon a preponderance of the credible evidence in the record. *Hartman v. Polystyrene Products Co., Inc.*, 164-BH-83; *Ward v. Maryland Permalite, Inc.*, 30-BR-85; *Weimer v. Dept. of Transportation*, 869-BH-87; *Scruggs v. Division of Correction*, 347-BH-89; *Ivey v. Catterton Printing Co.*, 441-BH-89.

As the Court of Appeals explained in *Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation v. Hider*, 349 Md. 71, 82, 706 A.2d 1073 (1998), "in enacting the unemployment compensation program, the legislature created a graduated, three-tiered system of disqualifications from benefits based on employee misconduct. The severity of the disqualification increases in proportion to the seriousness of the misconduct."

Dept. of Labor, Licensing & Regulation v. Boardley, 164 Md. 404, 408 fn.1 (2005).

Section 8-1002 of the Labor and Employment Article defines gross misconduct as conduct of an employee that is a deliberate and willful disregard of standards of behavior that an employing unit rightfully expects and that shows gross indifference to the interests of the employing unit or repeated violations of employment rules that prove a regular and wanton disregard of the employee's obligations.

The term "misconduct" as used in the statute means a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, the commission of a forbidden act, a dereliction from duty, or a course of wrongful conduct committed by an employee within the scope of his employment relationship, during hours of employment or on the employer's premises, within the meaning of Section 8-1003 of the Labor and Employment Article. (See, *Rogers v. Radio Shack*, 271 Md. 126, 314 A.2d 113).

Simple misconduct within the meaning of §8-1003 does not require intentional misbehavior. *DLLR v. Hider*, 349 Md. 71 (1998); also see *Johns Hopkins University v. Board of Labor, Licensing and Regulation*, 134 Md. App. 653, 662-63 (2000) (psychiatric condition which prevented claimant from conforming his/her conduct to accepted norms did not except that conduct from the category of misconduct under § 8-1003). Misconduct must be connected with the work; the mere fact that misconduct adversely affects the employer's interests is not enough. *Fino v. Maryland Emp. Sec. Bd.*, 218 Md. 504 (1959). Although not sufficient in itself, a breach of duty to an employer is an essential element to make an act connected with the work. *Empl. Sec. Bd. v. LeCates*, 218 Md. 202 (1958). Misconduct, however, need not occur during the hours of employment or the employer's premises. *Id.*

Without sufficient evidence of a willful and wanton disregard of an employee's obligations or gross indifference to the employer's interests, there can be no finding of gross misconduct. *Lehman v. Baker Protective Services, Inc.*, 221-BR-89. Where a showing of gross misconduct is based on a single action, the employer must show the employee demonstrated gross indifference to the employer's interests. *DLLR v. Muddiman*, 120 Md. App. 725, 737 (1998).

In determining whether an employee has committed gross misconduct, "[t]he important element to be considered is the nature of the misconduct and how seriously it affects the claimant's employment or the employer's rights." *Dept. of Econ. & Empl. Dev. v. Jones*, 79 Md. App. 531, 536 (1989). "It is also proper to note that what is 'deliberate and willful misconduct' will vary with each particular case. Here we 'are not looking simply for substandard conduct...but for a willful or wanton state of mind accompanying the engaging in substandard conduct.'" *Employment Sec. Bd. v. LeCates*, 218 Md. 202, 207 (1958)(internal citation omitted); also see *Hernandez v. DLLR*, 122 Md. App. 19, 25 (1998).

Aggravated misconduct is an amplification of gross misconduct where the claimant engages in "behavior committed with actual malice and deliberate disregard for the property, safety or life of others that...affects the employer, fellow employees, subcontractors, invitees of the employer, members of the public, or the ultimate consumer of the employer's products or services...and consists of either a physical assault or property loss so serious that the penalties of misconduct or gross misconduct are not sufficient."

In the instant case, the claimant rejected out of hand the employer's request to undergo training to improve her typing skills, a part of her job requirement. This refusal was unreasonable without determining whether the employer was willing to give the claimant additional time to find out whether keyboard training was available, the cost of the training, and who would bear the cost of such training. The claimant's unreasonable refusal constitutes gross misconduct in connection with the work, the employer's appeal notwithstanding.


The Board notes that the hearing examiner did not offer or admit the *Agency Fact Finding Report* into evidence. The Board did not consider this document when rendering its decision.

The Board finds based on a preponderance of the credible evidence that the employer has met its burden of demonstrating that the claimant's actions rose to the level of gross misconduct within the meaning of §8-1002. The decision shall be reversed for the reasons stated herein.


DECISION

It is held that the claimant was discharged for gross misconduct connected with the work, within the meaning of Maryland Code Annotated, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 1002. The claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits from the week beginning April 22, 2012 and until the claimant becomes re-employed, earns at least twenty five times their weekly benefit amount and thereafter becomes unemployed through no fault of their own.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson

RD/lj

Copies mailed to:

KENDRA S. HANS

RUSSELL INSURANCE GROUP

Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION

KENDRA S HANS

SSN #

Claimant

vs.

RUSSELL INSURANCE GROUP

Employer/Agency

Before the:

**Maryland Department of Labor,
Licensing and Regulation**

Division of Appeals

1100 North Eutaw Street

Room 511

Baltimore, MD 21201

(410) 767-2421

Appeal Number: 1218828

Appellant: Claimant

Local Office : 60 / LARGO

June 15, 2012

For the Claimant: PRESENT

For the Employer: PRESENT , DANIEL J COUGHLIN

For the Agency:

ISSUE(S)

Whether the claimant's separation from this employment was for a disqualifying reason within the meaning of the MD. Code Annotated, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Sections 1001 (Voluntary Quit for good cause), 1002 - 1002.1 (Gross/Aggravated Misconduct connected with the work), or 1003 (Misconduct connected with the work).

FINDINGS OF FACT

The claimant, Kendra S. Hans, worked for Russell Insurance Group from April 10, 2012 until April 25, 2012. The claimant earned \$576.00 per week while working full time as a commercial lines customer service representative trainee.

The claimant was hired and given two (2) weeks of training, assigned to an employee of the insurance agency. She was on a 90 day probationary period when hired that provided for 30 day periods for reviews, at the end of which the employer retained the right to terminate the claimant or the claimant could, at her option, terminate her employment without notice to the employer.

As a customer service representative, the claimant was required to type information and enter it into a computer data base. The claimant has limited typing proficiency that was compounded by the fact that the computer keyboard she was using had letters worn off of the keys. Typing proficiency was not discussed by either the claimant or the employer when she was interviewed for the job.

On her last day of work, the claimant met with her supervisor and the General Manager of the business. At the meeting, management expressed concern over the claimant's limited typing ability. They told the claimant that she should take training in typing and gave her 30 days to complete any training. The employer did not offer any particular place, time or method of training, offer to pay for it or tell the claimant that payment was her responsibility. She was told she would be reassessed by the employer after she completed training. The claimant did not inform her employer that the keyboard was in need of repair or replacement. The claimant told the employer that she had tried training and it did not work and that she could not learn traditional keyboard methods to type. She therefore declined to take up the training the employer required for her to adequately do her job. The employer then told her that she should probably spend some time taking care of her sick mother and the claimant left the premises and did not return to work.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1002 provides that an individual shall be disqualified from receiving benefits where he or she is discharged or suspended from employment because of behavior which demonstrates gross misconduct. The statute defines gross misconduct as conduct that is a deliberate and willful disregard of standards that an employer has a right to expect and that shows a gross indifference to the employer's interests. Employment Sec. Bd. v. LeCates, 218 Md. 202, 145 A.2d 840 (1958); Painter v. Department of Emp. & Training, et al. 68 Md. App. 356, 511 A.2d 585 (1986); Department of Economic and Employment Dev. v. Hager, 96 Md. App. 362, 625 A.2d 342 (1993).

Md. Code, Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1002 provides that an individual shall be disqualified from receiving benefits when he or she was discharged or suspended from employment because of behavior that demonstrates gross misconduct. The statute defines gross misconduct as repeated violations of employment rules that prove a regular and wanton disregard of the employee's obligations.

Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003 provides for a disqualification from benefits where the claimant is discharged or suspended as a disciplinary measure for misconduct connected with the work. The term "misconduct" is undefined in the statute but has been defined as "...a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, the commission of a forbidden act, a dereliction of duty, or a course of wrongful conduct committed by an employee, within the scope of his employment relationship, during hours of employment, or on the employer's premises." Rogers v. Radio Shack, 271 Md. 126, 132 (1974).

Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1001 provides that an individual shall be disqualified for benefits where unemployment is due to leaving work voluntarily without good cause arising from or connected with the conditions of employment or actions of the employer, or without valid circumstances. A circumstance is valid only if it is (i) a substantial cause that is directly attributable to, arising from, or connected with conditions of employment or actions of the employing unit; or (ii) of such necessitous or compelling nature that the individual has no reasonable alternative other than leaving the employment.

The term "leaving work voluntarily" is not defined anywhere in Section 8-1001, and absent some imperative reason for enlarging its meaning, the term should be construed as having its ordinary and commonly accepted meaning. Allen v. CORE Target City Youth Program, 275 Md. 69, 338 A.2d 237 (1975).

The phrase "leaving work voluntarily" has a plain, definite, and sensible meaning, free of ambiguity. It expresses a clear legislative intent that to disqualify a claimant from benefits, the evidence must establish that the claimant, by his own choice, intentionally, of his own free will, terminated the employment. Allen v. CORE Target City Youth Program, 275 Md. 69, 338 A.2d 237 (1975).

EVALUATION OF THE EVIDENCE

The first determination that must be made in an unemployment hearing is whether the claimant quit or was discharged. That is, it must be decided who was the moving party to cause the separation. In the instant case the employer told the claimant that she was in need of training because her typing skills were lacking. The employer wanted her to take some training and be re-evaluated in 30 days. The claimant declined to undergo training because she believed she was not capable of improving her typing skills. The employer therefore made the training a condition of continued employment and when the claimant declined to pursue this requirement, the employer severed the relationship in a euphemistic way by suggesting that she spend time caring for her sick mother.

In a discharge case the employer has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the credible evidence presented at the hearing that the discharge was for some form of misconduct, as that term is defined above. Ivey v. Catterton Printing Company, 441-BH-89. In this case, the employer

The employer required the claimant to undergo training to improve her typing skills, a part of her job requirements. The request was reasonable in light of the claimant's lack of typing skills and the requirements of her work. The claimant refused to attempt training because she had taken such training in the past without improving her skills. This refusal was unreasonable without determining whether the employer was willing to give additional time to find whether alternative keyboard training was available, what the costs were and who would bear the costs of such alternatives. In short, the claimant rejected the employer's request out of hand without pursuing any alternatives concerning training. This refusal was unreasonable and therefore constitutes misconduct in connection with the work.

I hold that the claimant committed a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, a forbidden act, a dereliction of duty, or engaged in a course of wrongful conduct within the scope of the claimant's employment relationship, during hours of employment, or on the employer's premises. An unemployment disqualification shall be imposed based on Md. Code, Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003 pursuant to this separation from this employment.

DECISION

IT IS HELD THAT the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003. Benefits are denied for the week beginning April 22, 2012 and for the four (4) weeks immediately following. The claimant will then be eligible for benefits so long as all other eligibility requirements are met. The claimant may contact Claimant

Information Service concerning the other eligibility requirements of the law at ui@dllr.state.md.us or call 410-949-0022 from the Baltimore region, or 1-800-827-4839 from outside the Baltimore area. Deaf claimants with TTY may contact Client Information Service at 410-767-2727, or outside the Baltimore area at 1-800-827-4400.

The determination of the Claims Examiner is reversed.

B. Taylor

B. Taylor, Esq.
Hearing Examiner

Notice of Right to Request Waiver of Overpayment

The Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation may seek recovery of any overpayment received by the Claimant. Pursuant to Section 8-809 of the Labor and Employment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, and Code of Maryland Regulations 09.32.07.01 through 09.32.07.09, the Claimant has a right to request a waiver of recovery of this overpayment. This request may be made by contacting Overpayment Recoveries Unit at 410-767-2404. If this request is made, the Claimant is entitled to a hearing on this issue.

A request for waiver of recovery of overpayment does not act as an appeal of this decision.

Esto es un documento legal importante que decide si usted recibirá los beneficios del seguro del desempleo. Si usted disiente de lo que fue decidido, usted tiene un tiempo limitado a apelar esta decisión. Si usted no entiende cómo apelar, usted puede contactar (301) 313-8000 para una explicación.

Notice of Right to Petition for Review

Any party may request a review either in person, by facsimile or by mail with the Board of Appeals. Under COMAR 09.32.06.01A(1) appeals may not be filed by e-mail. Your appeal must be filed by July 02, 2012. You may file your request for further appeal in person at or by mail to the following address:

Board of Appeals
1100 North Eutaw Street
Room 515
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Fax 410-767-2787
Phone 410-767-2781

NOTE: Appeals filed by mail are considered timely on the date of the U.S. Postal Service postmark.

Date of hearing : June 12,2012

CH/Specialist ID: UTW1K

Seq No: 003

Copies mailed on June 15, 2012 to:

KENDRA S. HANS

RUSSELL INSURANCE GROUP

LOCAL OFFICE #60