

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2023-EAB-1001

Reversed
Disqualification

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On July 20, 2023, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was discharged for misconduct and therefore was disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective May 28, 2023 (decision # 84231). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On August 21, 2023, ALJ Enyinnaya conducted a hearing at which the employer failed to appear, and on August 29, 2023 issued Order No. 23-UI-234496, reversing decision # 84231 by concluding that claimant was discharged but not for misconduct and was not disqualified from receiving benefits based on the work separation. On September 1, 2023, the employer filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: The employer did not declare that they provided a copy of their argument to the opposing party or parties as required by OAR 471-041-0080(2)(a) (May 13, 2019). The argument also contained information that was not part of the hearing record, and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond the employer's reasonable control prevented them from offering the information during the hearing as required by OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019). EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing when reaching this decision. *See* ORS 657.275(2).

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Foster Innovative Technology LLC employed claimant as a territory representative from August 15, 2022 until May 31, 2023. The employer "represented" or marketed products on behalf of third-party companies. Audio Record at 10:20.

(2) Claimant was the employer's sole employee and would sometimes receive items from the third-party companies that the employer would not sell for the companies but were items used for sample or demo purposes. The employer expected claimant to return these sample items to the third-party companies and not sell them and keep the proceeds. Claimant knew or should have known as a matter of common sense that selling sample or demo items without prior authorization would probably result in a violation of the employer's expectations.

(3) In early May 2023, claimant sold some of the sample items he acquired from a third-party company that the employer was no longer representing. The items sold for a few hundred dollars and claimant kept the proceeds from the sale.

(4) On or about May 26, 2023, the employer discovered that claimant had sold the sample items and kept the proceeds.

(5) On June 1, 2023, the employer and claimant met in person to conduct an accounting of all the sample items claimant had in his possession and to ensure that they were returned to the applicable third-party company. At the beginning of that meeting, the employer discharged claimant for selling the sample items in early May 2023 and keeping the proceeds.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: The employer discharged claimant for misconduct.

ORS 657.176(2)(a) requires a disqualification from unemployment insurance benefits if the employer discharged claimant for misconduct connected with work. “As used in ORS 657.176(2)(a) . . . a willful or wantonly negligent violation of the standards of behavior which an employer has the right to expect of an employee is misconduct. An act or series of actions that amount to a willful or wantonly negligent disregard of an employer’s interest is misconduct.” OAR 471-030-0038(3)(a) (September 22, 2020). “[W]antonly negligent’ means indifference to the consequences of an act or series of actions, or a failure to act or a series of failures to act, where the individual acting or failing to act is conscious of his or her conduct and knew or should have known that his or her conduct would probably result in a violation of the standards of behavior which an employer has the right to expect of an employee.” OAR 471-030-0038(1)(c). In a discharge case, the employer has the burden to establish misconduct by a preponderance of evidence. *Babcock v. Employment Division*, 25 Or App 661, 550 P2d 1233 (1976).

Isolated instances of poor judgment are not misconduct. OAR 471-030-0038(3)(b). The following standards apply to determine whether an “isolated instance of poor judgment” occurred:

(A) The act must be isolated. The exercise of poor judgment must be a single or infrequent occurrence rather than a repeated act or pattern of other willful or wantonly negligent behavior.

(B) The act must involve judgment. A judgment is an evaluation resulting from discernment and comparison. Every conscious decision to take an action (to act or not to act) in the context of an employment relationship is a judgment for purposes of OAR 471-030-0038(3).

(C) The act must involve poor judgment. A decision to willfully violate an employer’s reasonable standard of behavior is poor judgment. A conscious decision to take action that results in a wantonly negligent violation of an employer’s reasonable standard of behavior is poor judgment. A conscious decision not to comply with an unreasonable employer policy is not misconduct.

(D) Acts that violate the law, acts that are tantamount to unlawful conduct, acts that create irreparable breaches of trust in the employment relationship or otherwise make a

continued employment relationship impossible exceed mere poor judgment and do not fall within the exculpatory provisions of OAR 471-030-0038(3).

OAR 471-030-0038(1)(d).

The order under review concluded that the employer discharged claimant, but not for misconduct because claimant's conduct was an isolated instance of poor judgment. Order No. 23-UI-234496 at 3. The record does not support that conclusion.

At hearing, the employer failed to appear, and claimant testified that he did not know of any policy that prohibited him from selling the sample items and keeping the proceeds. Audio Record at 21:29. However, as a matter of common sense and customary workplace practice, claimant should have known that it would probably violate the employer's expectations to sell sample items and keep the proceeds without permission from the employer. Furthermore, as claimant acknowledged at hearing, he could have asked clarification as to whether the employer would allow him to sell the sample items, but claimant failed to do so. Audio Record at 22:19. Claimant was indifferent to the consequences of his actions for failing to seek clarification. Finally, claimant was conscious of his conduct in selling the sample items because he sold them fully aware of what he was doing. Therefore, the record shows that claimant violated the employer's prohibition on selling the sample items with wanton negligence.

Claimant's wantonly negligent violation of the employer's expectation exceeded mere poor judgment and was not an isolated instance of poor judgment. Claimant's conduct exceeded mere poor judgment because it was tantamount to unlawful conduct in that it was tantamount to the crime of theft in the second degree. ORS 164.045. Per ORS 164.045, theft in the second degree occurs when a person commits theft as defined in ORS 164.015 and when the total value of property in a single or aggregate transaction is \$100 or more and less than \$1,000. As relevant here, theft occurs under ORS 164.015 when a person, with the intent to deprive another of property, takes property from an owner thereof. Here, the sample items were worth a few hundred dollars and claimant took the property from the owner, the third-party company, by selling it. The record fails to show that the employer ever told claimant to discard the sample items. Therefore, claimant's conduct was tantamount to theft in the second degree. Thus, claimant's conduct exceeded mere poor judgment and was not an isolated instance of poor judgment.

For these reasons, the employer discharged claimant for misconduct and claimant was disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective May 28, 2023.

DECISION: Order No. 23-UI-234496 is set aside, as outlined above.

S. Serres and A. Steger-Bentz;
D. Hettle, not participating.

DATE of Service: October 12, 2023

NOTE: You may appeal this decision by filing a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals within 30 days of the date of service listed above. *See* ORS 657.282. For forms and information, you may write to the Oregon Court of Appeals, Records Section, 1163 State Street, Salem,

Oregon 97310 or visit the Court of Appeals website at courts.oregon.gov. Once on the website, use the ‘search’ function to search for ‘petition for judicial review employment appeals board’. A link to the forms and information will be among the search results.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. You can access the survey using a computer, tablet, or smartphone. If you are unable to complete the survey online and need a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Traditional Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Tagalog

Paalala – Nakakaapekto ang desisyong ito sa iyong mga benepisyo sa pagkawala ng trabaho. Kung hindi mo naiintindihan ang desisyong ito, makipag-ugnayan kaagad sa Lupon ng mga Apela sa Trabaho (Employment Appeals Board). Kung hindi ka sumasang-ayon sa desisyong ito, maaari kang maghain ng isang Petisyon sa Pagsusuri ng Hukuman (Petition for Judicial Review) sa Hukuman sa Paghahabol (Court of Appeals) ng Oregon na sinusunod ang mga tagubilin na nakasulat sa dulo ng desisyon.

Vietnamese

Chú ý - Quyết định này ảnh hưởng đến trợ cấp thất nghiệp của quý vị. Nếu quý vị không hiểu quyết định này, hãy liên lạc với Ban Kháng Cáo Việc Làm ngay lập tức. Nếu quý vị không đồng ý với quyết định này, quý vị có thể nộp Đơn Xin Tái Xét Tư Pháp với Tòa Kháng Cáo Oregon theo các hướng dẫn được viết ra ở cuối quyết định này.

Spanish

Atención – Esta decisión afecta sus beneficios de desempleo. Si no entiende esta decisión, comuníquese inmediatamente con la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo. Si no está de acuerdo con esta decisión, puede presentar una Aplicación de Revisión Judicial ante el Tribunal de Apelaciones de Oregon siguiendo las instrucciones escritas al final de la decisión.

Russian

Внимание – Данное решение влияет на ваше пособие по безработице. Если решение Вам непонятно – немедленно обратитесь в Апелляционный Комитет по Трудоустройству. Если Вы не согласны с принятым решением, вы можете подать Ходатайство о Пересмотре Судебного Решения в Апелляционный Суд штата Орегон, следуя инструкциям, описанным в конце решения.

Khmer

ចំណុចសំខាន់ – សេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះមានផលប៉ះពាល់ដល់អត្ថប្រយោជន៍គ្មានការងារធ្វើរបស់លោកអ្នក។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់អំពីសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ សូមទាក់ទងគណៈកម្មការឧទ្ធរណ៍ការងារភ្លាមៗ។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់ស្របចំពោះសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះទេ លោកអ្នកអាចដាក់ពាក្យប្តឹងសុំឲ្យមានការពិនិត្យរឿងក្តីឡើងវិញជាមួយតុលាការឧទ្ធរណ៍រដ្ឋ Oregon ដោយអនុវត្តតាមសេចក្តីណែនាំដែលសរសេរនៅខាងចុងបញ្ចប់នៃសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ។

Laotian

ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ – ຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້ມີຜົນກະທົບຕໍ່ກັບເງິນຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອການຫວ່າງງານຂອງທ່ານ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້, ກະລຸນາຕິດຕໍ່ຫາຄະນະກຳມະການອຸທອນການຈ້າງງານໃນທັນທີ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຫັນດີນຳຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້, ທ່ານສາມາດຍື່ນຄຳຮ້ອງຂໍການທົບທວນຄຳຕັດສິນນຳສານອຸທອນລັດ Oregon ໄດ້ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄຳແນະນຳທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້.

Arabic

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فوراً، و إذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار.

Farsi

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از دستور العمل موجود در پایان آن، از دادگاه تجدید نظر اورگان درخواست تجدید نظر کنید.

Employment Appeals Board - 875 Union Street NE | Salem, OR 97311
 Phone: (503) 378-2077 | 1-800-734-6949 | Fax: (503) 378-2129 | TDD: 711
www.Oregon.gov/Employ/eab

The Oregon Employment Department is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. Language assistance is available to persons with limited English proficiency at no cost.

El Departamento de Empleo de Oregon es un programa que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades. Disponemos de servicios o ayudas auxiliares, formatos alternos y asistencia de idiomas para personas con discapacidades o conocimiento limitado del inglés, a pedido y sin costo.