ORDER OF REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

This case comes before the Commission for disposition of the employer's appeal pursuant to Section 443.151(4)(c), Florida Statutes, of a referee’s decision which held the claimant not disqualified from receipt of benefits and charged the employer’s account.

Upon consideration, the Commission finds that the appeal of the referee’s decision was timely filed. The Commission has jurisdiction to decide the case.

Pursuant to the appeal filed in this case, the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission has conducted a complete review of the evidentiary hearing record and decision of the appeals referee. See §443.151(4)(c), Fla. Stat. By law, the Commission’s review is limited to those matters that were presented to the referee and are contained in the official record.

The referee’s findings of fact state as follows:

The claimant worked as a laborer for a civil construction company from October 8, 2012, until May 28, 2013. The employer has a no tolerance policy regarding open possession of a firearm on the jobsite. Violation could result in suspension or termination. On May 23, 2013, the claimant got into a verbal altercation with the foreman after the foreman stepped on the claimant's foot. When the foreman stepped on the claimant's foot the claimant said, "I'm tired of being your bitch!" At that time the foreman went to the office manager and notified her of the altercation. An investigation was initiated to see if the foreman's action[s] were intentional and to find out what the claimant said and if his words were malicious. On May 27, 2013, a co-worker went to the office
manager and told her the claimant had a gun and had shown it to him. The information prompted the office manager to start a new investigation regarding the gun allegations. On May 28, 2013, the claimant was discharged for allegedly having a gun on the jobsite. The claimant contends he did not have a gun at the jobsite.

Based on these findings, the referee held the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct connected with work. Upon review of the record and the arguments on appeal, the Commission concludes the referee mischaracterized the quality of the employer’s evidence; consequently, the case must be remanded.

The record reflects the employer discharged the claimant for allegedly violating the employer’s policy prohibiting open possession of a firearm in the workplace. The employer presented two employees for the hearing who testified that the claimant showed them a gun he had under the seat of his car. During the hearing, the claimant denied showing the co-workers a gun and claimed he no longer had a gun because it had been stolen the prior year. The appeals referee resolved material conflicts in the evidence in favor of the claimant and concluded the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct.

Florida Administrative Code Rule 73B-20.025(3)(d) requires that the referee, if confronted with conflicting evidence with respect to a disputed issue of fact, the finding of which is determinative of the outcome of the appeal, shall acknowledge such conflict and set forth the rationale by which that conflict is resolved.

While the referee resolved evidentiary conflicts in favor of the claimant, he also stated in his conclusion that the employer’s witnesses were unable to provide competent evidence to show the claimant had a gun at the jobsite. Competent evidence is evidence that is admissible in a court of law. The employer presented two firsthand witnesses who testified that the claimant showed them his gun at the jobsite. Since firsthand testimony of a witness is generally admissible in a court of law, the employer’s evidence appears competent. The evidence is also probative, that is, it tends to prove that the claimant did what he was accused of by the employer. Thus, the referee must weigh the evidence and determine whether or not the evidence is more credible than the claimant’s denials of that testimony.

On remand, the referee is directed to clarify his analysis of the evidence presented at the hearing. The referee needs to explain whether the evidence presented was competent, and, if not competent, why was it not competent. The referee should then determine whether the evidence was or was not more credible than the claimant’s testimony. If the referee meant that the evidence was not credible rather than competent, the referee should clarify the decision in that
regard. The referee’s decision, therefore, is vacated and the case is remanded to allow the referee to give proper analysis to the employer’s evidence. The referee shall then render a new decision that decides whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work within the meaning of the reemployment assistance law.

The decision of the appeals referee is vacated and the case is remanded for further proceedings.

It is so ordered.

REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION
Frank E. Brown, Chairman
Thomas D. Epsky, Member
Joseph D. Finnegan, Member

This is to certify that on 5/27/2014, the above Order was filed in the office of the Clerk of the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, and a copy mailed to the last known address of each interested party.

By: Kimberley Pena
Deputy Clerk
DECISION OF APPEALS REFEREE

Important appeal rights are explained at the end of this decision.
Derechos de apelación importantes son explicados al final de esta decisión.
Yo eksplike kék dwa dapèl enpòtan lan fen desizyon sa a.

Issues Involved:
SEPARATION: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work or voluntarily left work without good cause as defined in the statute, pursuant to Sections 443.101(1), (9), (10), (11); 443.036(30), Florida Statutes; Rule 73B-11.020, Florida Administrative Code.

CHARGES TO EMPLOYMENT RECORD: Whether benefit payments made to the claimant shall be charged to the employment record of the employer, pursuant to Sections 443.101(9); 443.131(3)(a), Florida Statutes; Rules 73B-10.026, 11.018, Florida Administrative Code. (If employer charges are not at issue on the current claim, the hearing may determine charges on a subsequent claim.)

Findings of Fact: The claimant worked as a laborer for a civil construction company from October 8, 2012, until May 28, 2013. The employer has a no tolerance policy regarding open possession of a firearm on the jobsite. Violation could result in suspension or termination. On May 23, 2013, the claimant got into a verbal altercation with the foreman after the foreman stepped on the claimant’s foot. When the foreman
stepped on the claimant’s foot the claimant said, “I’m tired of being your bitch!” At that time the foreman went to the office manager and notified her of the altercation. An investigation was initiated to see if the foreman’s action were intentional and to find out what the claimant said and if his words were malicious. On May 27, 2013, a co-worker went to the office manager and told her the claimant had a gun and had shown it to him. The information prompted the office manager to start a new investigation regarding the gun allegations. On May 28, 2013, the claimant was discharged for allegedly having a gun on the jobsite. The claimant contends he did not have a gun at the jobsite.

**Conclusions of Law:** As of June 27, 2011, the Reemployment Assistance Law of Florida defines misconduct connected with work as, but is not limited to, the following, which may not be construed in pari materia with each other:

(a) Conduct demonstrating conscious disregard of an employer’s interests and found to be a deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expects of his or her employee.

(b) Carelessness or negligence to a degree or recurrence that manifests culpability, or wrongful intent, or shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer’s interest or of the employee’s duties and obligations to his or her employer.

(c) Chronic absenteeism or tardiness in deliberate violation of a known policy of the employer or one or more unapproved absences following a written reprimand or warning relating to more than one unapproved absence.

(d) A willful and deliberate violation of a standard or regulation of this state by an employee of an employer licensed or certified by this
state, which violation would cause the employer to be sanctioned or have its license or certification suspended by this state.

(e) A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:

1. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rules requirements;

2. The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or

3. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.

The record shows the claimant was discharged. The burden of proving misconduct is on the employer. Lewis v. Unemployment Appeals Commission, 498 So.2d 608 (Fla. 5th DCA 1986). The proof must be by a preponderance of competent substantial evidence. De Groot v. Sheffield, 95 So.2d 912 (Fla. 1957); Tallahassee Housing Authority v. Unemployment Appeals Commission, 483 So.2d 413 (Fla. 1986). The employer started an investigation for the altercation between the claimant and the foreman. The employer testified that during the investigation it was brought to their attention that the claimant had shown two of his co-workers a gun he had in his car. At that time a new investigation was initiated on whether or not the claimant had a gun and if he was showing it to co-workers. The employer's witnesses were unable to provide competent evidence to show the claimant in fact had a gun at the jobsite. The claimant testified that his gun had been stolen in 2012 and had not purchased a new one. The claimant testified that the only time he had talked to a co-worker about a gun was when the co-worker asked him how he could purchase one now that he was a legal citizen. The claimant was never spoken to by the employer about the gun issue prior to being discharged. The employer was unable to show the claimant violated an employer's rule. Accordingly, no actions were done by the claimant that
rose to the level of misconduct. Therefore, the claimant is qualified for receipt of benefits.

The law provides that benefits will not be charged to the employment record of a contributing employer who furnishes required notice to the Department when the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with the work.

The record shows the employer was unable to show the claimant was discharged for misconduct. Accordingly, the employer’s tax account will be charged.

The hearing officer was presented with conflicting testimony regarding material issues of fact and is charged with resolving these conflicts. In Order Number 2003-10946 (December 9, 2003), the Commission set forth factors to be considered in resolving credibility questions. These factors include the witness’ opportunity and capacity to observe the event or act in question; any prior inconsistent statement by the witness; witness bias or lack of bias; the contradiction of the witness’ version of events by other evidence or its consistency with other evidence; the inherent improbability of the witness’ version of events; and the witness’ demeanor. Upon considering these factors, the hearing officer finds the testimony of the claimant to be more credible. Therefore, material conflicts in the evidence are resolved in favor of the claimant.

**Decision:** The determination dated July 26, 2013, is REVERSED. The claimant is qualified for receipt of benefits. The employer’s tax account will be charged.

If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination, unless specified in this decision. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.
This is to certify that a copy of the above decision was mailed to the last known address of each interested party on October 4, 2013.

By: [Signature]
JODEE L. GOMILLION, Deputy Clerk

GERREN MARDIS
Appeals Referee

IMPORTANT - APPEAL RIGHTS: This decision will become final unless a written request for review or reopening is filed within 20 calendar days after the mailing date shown. If the 20th day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday defined in F.A.C. 73B-21.004, filing may be made on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or holiday. If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown below and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

A party who did not attend the hearing for good cause may request reopening, including the reason for not attending, at https://iap.floridajobs.org/ or by writing to the address at the top of this decision. The date the confirmation number is generated will be the filing date of a request for reopening on the Appeals Web Site.

A party who attended the hearing and received an adverse decision may file a request for review to the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Ryne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); https://raaciap.floridajobs.org/. If mailed, the postmark date will be the filing date. If faxed, hand-delivered, delivered by courier service other than the United States Postal Service, or submitted via the Internet, the date of receipt will be the filing date. To avoid delay, include the docket number and claimant’s social security number. A party requesting review should specify any and all allegations of error with respect to the referee’s decision, and provide factual and/or legal support for these challenges. Allegations of error not specifically set forth in the request for review may be considered waived.

IMPORTANTANTE - DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN: Esta decisión pasará a ser final a menos que una solicitud por escrito para revisión o reapertura se registre dentro de 20 días de calendario después de la fecha marcada en que la decisión fue remitida por correo. Si el vigésimo (20) día es un sábado, un domingo o un feriado definidos en F.A.C. 73B-21.004, el registro de la solicitud se puede realizar en el día siguiente que no sea un sábado, un domingo o un feriado. Si esta decisión descalifica y/o declara al reclamante como inelegible para recibir beneficios que ya fueron recibidos por el reclamante, se le requerirá al reclamante rembolsar esos beneficios. La cantidad específica de cualquier sobrepago [pago excesivo de beneficios] será calculada por la Agencia y establecida en una determinación de pago excesivo de beneficios que será emitida por separado. Sin embargo, el límite de tiempo para solicitar la revisión de esta decisión es como se establece anteriormente y dicho límite no es detenido, demorado o extendido por ninguna otra determinación, decisión u orden.

Una parte que no asistió a la audiencia por una buena causa puede solicitar una reapertura, incluyendo la razón por no haber comparecido en la audiencia, en https://iap.floridajobs.org/ o escribiendo a la dirección en la parte superior de esta decisión. La fecha en que se genera el número de confirmación será la fecha de registro de una solicitud de reapertura realizada en el Sitio Web de la Oficina de Apelaciones.
Una parte que asistió a la audiencia y recibió una decisión adversa puede registrar una solicitud de revisión con la Comisión de Apelaciones de Desempleo; Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); https://raaciap.floridajobs.org/. Si la solicitud es enviada por correo, la fecha del sello de la oficina de correos será la fecha de registro de la solicitud. Si es enviada por telefax, entregada a mano, entregada por servicio de mensajería, con la excepción del Servicio Postal de Estados Unidos, o realizada vía el Internet, la fecha en la que se recibe la solicitud será la fecha de registro. Para evitar demora, incluya el número de expediente [docket number] y el número de seguro social del reclamante. Una parte que solicita una revisión debe especificar cualquiera y todos los alegatos de error con respecto a la decisión del árbitro, y proporcionar fundamentos reales y/o legales para sustanciar éstos desafíos. Los alegatos de error que no se establezcan con especificidad en la solicitud de revisión pueden considerarse como renunciados.

ENPÔTAN – DWA DAPÈL: Desizyon sa a ap definitif sôf si ou depo ze yon apèl nan yon delè 20 jou apre dat nou poste sa a ba ou. Si 20ème jou a se yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje, jan sa defini lan F.A.C. 73B-21.004, depo an kapab fèt jou aprè a, si se pa yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje. Si desizyon an diskalifie epì/oswa deklare moun k ap ëf demann lan pa kalifie pou aloksyon li resevwa deja, moun k ap ëf demann lan ap gen pou li remèt lajan li te reseuvwa a. Se Ajan lan k ap kalkile montan nenpòt ki peman anplís epì y ap detèmine sa lan yon desizyon sepere. Sepandan, delè pou mande revizyon desizyon sa a se delè yo bay anwo a; Okenn lòt detèminasyon, desizyon oswa lòd pa ka rete, retade oubyen pqalonje dat sa a.

Yon pati ki te gen yon rezon valab pou li pat asiste seyans lan gen dwa mande pou yo ouvri ka a ankò; fòk yo bay rezon yo pat ka vini an epi ëf demann nan sou sitwèb sa a, https://iap.floridajobs.org/ oswa alekri nan adres ki manisyone okomansman desizyon sa a. Dat yo pwodui nimewo konfimasyon an se va dat yo prezante demann nan pou revouvi kòz la sou Sitwèb Apèl la.

Yon pati ki te asiste seyans la epi ki pat satisfè desizyon yo te pran an gen dwa mande yon revizyon nan men Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); https://raaciap.floridajobs.org/. Si ou voye 1 pa lapòs, dat ki sou tenb la ap dat ou depo ze apèl la. Si ou depo ze apèl la sou yon sitwèb, ou fakse li, bay li men nan lamen, oswa voye li pa yon sève mesajri ki pa Sévis Lapòs Lèzetazinì (United States Postal Service), oswa voye li pa Entènèt, dat ki sou resi a se va dat depo a. Pou evite reta, mete nimewo rejìs la (docket number) avèk nimewo sekirite sosyal moun k ap ëf demann lan. Yon pati k ap mande revizyon dwe presize nenpòt ki alegasyon èrè nan kad desizyon abit la, epi bay baz reyèl oubyen legal pou apiye alegasyon sa yo. Yo p ap pran an konsiderasyon alegasyon èrè ki pa byen presize nan demann pou revizyon an.

Any questions related to benefits or claim certifications should be referred to the Claims Information Center at 1-800-204-2418. An equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. Voice telephone numbers on this document may be reached by persons using TTY/TDD equipment via the Florida Relay Service at 711.