

- DECISION -

Claimant:
ANTONIO T FOGG

Decision No.: 5477-BR-11

Date: September 19, 2011

Appeal No.: 1100284

S.S. No.:

Employer:
ARMY

L.O. No.: 65

Appellant: Claimant

Issue: Whether the claimant meets the eligibility requirements to receive Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemen within the meaning of public law.

- 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: October 19, 2011

REVIEW ON THE RECORD

After a review on the record, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's findings of fact. The Board makes the following additional findings of fact:

The claimant's injury was incurred during the course of his initial training with the employer. He was treated and continued to try to pass the physical fitness test in order to complete his term of enlistment. When he could not successfully pass the physical fitness test, the employer released him from his obligation and advised him to take the necessary time to heal and then attempt to re-enlist. His separation was for a service-incurred injury.

The claimant would not have left the Army but for his injury and subsequent inability to pass the physical fitness test.

The Board concludes that these facts warrant different conclusions of law and a reversal of the hearing examiner's decision.

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(H)(1)*. The Board fully inquires into the facts of each particular case. *COMAR 09.32.06.02(E)*.

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). 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).

5 USC 8521 provides in pertinent part:

(a) For the purpose of this subchapter -

(1) "Federal service" means active service (not including active duty in a reserve status unless for a continuous period of 90 days or more) in the armed forces or the Commissioned Corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration if with respect to that service -

(A) the individual was discharged or released under honorable conditions (and, if an officer, did not resign for the good of the service); and

(B)(i) the individual was discharged or released after completing his first full term of active service which the individual initially agreed to serve, or

(ii) the individual was discharged or released before completing such term of active service -

(I) for the convenience of the Government under an early release program,

(II) because of medical disqualification, pregnancy, parenthood, or any service-incurred injury or disability [*emphasis added*]

In his appeal, the claimant refers to the above-cited section of the United States Code. The Board finds this to be applicable under the circumstances established by the evidence of record in this matter. The claimant has met the requirements to be eligible for benefits even though he did not complete his full term of service. The claimant was discharged by the employer due to his inability to pass the physical fitness

test which was caused by his service-incurred injury. The claimant is qualified for benefits if he is otherwise eligible.

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 not met its burden of demonstrating that the claimant's actions rose to the level of gross misconduct within the meaning of § 8-1002. The employer has also not met its burden of showing that the claimant's discharge was for misconduct within the meaning of § 8-1003. The decision shall be reversed for the reasons stated herein.

DECISION

It is held that the claimant was discharged, but not for gross misconduct or misconduct connected with the work, within the meaning of Maryland Code Annotated, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 1002 or 1003. No disqualification is imposed based upon the claimant's separation from employment with ARMY DFAS-INDIANAPOLIS.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member

RD/mw

Copies mailed to:

ANTONIO T. FOGG

ARMY

Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION

ANTONIO T FOGG

SSN #

Claimant

Vs.

ARMY

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: 1100284

Appellant: Claimant

Local Office : 65 / SALISBURY

CLAIM CENTER

March 18, 2011

For the Claimant: PRESENT, CLAUDETTE FOGG-CASTILLO

For the Employer:

For the Agency:

ISSUE(S)

Whether the claimant meets the eligibility requirements to receive Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemen within the meaning of public law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The claimant, Antonio Fogg, served as a E-3 Military Policeman from April 12, 2010 until December 13, 2010 with the US Army. He was discharged at this time because he could not pass the physical test after he injured his legs and could not complete the two mile run.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Title 5, United States Code, Section 8521(a) provides that former service members may be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits after release from active duty if they meet certain requirements. Among those requirements for persons who have completed their first full term of service are the requirement that they be separated from service under honorable conditions (and in the case of officers, did not resign for the good of the service).

EVALUATION OF THE EVIDENCE

The Hearing Examiner considered all of the testimony and evidence of record in reaching this decision. Where the evidence was in conflict, the Hearing Examiner decided the facts on the credible evidence as determined by the Hearing Examiner.

The evidence presented by the claimant did not establish he had fulfilled the requirements of the federal law, having failed to complete his full enlistment or active duty tour.

DECISION

IT IS HELD THAT the claimant was separated from the US Army for reasons which are disqualifying pursuant to Title 5, United States Code, Section 8521(a). Benefits are denied from December 11, 2010 and until meeting the requirements of the law. The claimant will then be eligible for benefits so long as all other 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 Specialist is reversed.

T. N. Evans, Jr.

T N Evans, Jr., 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 of Further Appeal

Any party may request a further appeal 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 April 4, 2011. 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: March 02, 2011

AEH/Specialist ID: QB16E

Seq No: 003

Copies mailed on March 18, 2011 to:

ANTONIO T. FOGG
ARMY
LOCAL OFFICE #65