

- DECISION -

Claimant:
LORETTA C BOYD

Decision No.: 3328-BR-13

Date: August 19, 2013

Appeal No.: 1306468

S.S. No.:

Employer:
ROSE HILL MANAGEMENT INC

L.O. No.: 64

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: September 18, 2013

REVIEW OF THE RECORD

After a review of the record, the Board adopts the hearing examiner's findings of fact. However, 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*. 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). 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).*

In its appeal, the employer contends the hearing examiner erred in excluding the video surveillance and in characterizing the witness' testimony concerning the content of that video as "hearsay". The employer compares this case to a similar case, before a different hearing examiner, which had a different result and in which the evidence was handled differently.

On appeal, the Board reviews the evidence of record from the Lower Appeals hearing. The Board will not order the taking of additional evidence or a new hearing unless there has been clear error, a defect in the record, or a failure of due process. The record is complete. Both parties appeared and testified. Both parties were given the opportunity to cross-examine opposing witnesses and to offer and object to documentary evidence. Both parties were offered closing statements. The necessary elements of due process were observed throughout the hearing. The Board finds no reason to order a new hearing or take additional evidence in this matter. Sufficient evidence exists in the record from which the Board may make its decision.

The Board has thoroughly reviewed the record from the hearing. The Board agrees with the employer's contention that the hearing examiner mischaracterized the witness' testimony relative to the video surveillance as "hearsay". That testimony was not hearsay. That was direct, first-hand testimony based upon the witness' own observations of the video. The video itself was hearsay, but the witness' testimony as to what she observed on that video and her conclusions therefrom was first-hand testimony. The Board gives that evidence more weight than that assigned by the hearing examiner.

The Board finds that the greater weight of the credible and competent evidence in the record supports a finding that the claimant was discharged for disqualifying misconduct. The employer's witness provided consistent testimony concerning the reasons for the claimant's discharge, based upon the content of the video and upon other observations. This testimony was no different, functionally, from the testimony of a witness who has personally observed a series of events. The evidence established that the claimant spent more time not doing her duties than doing her duties. Residents of the employer's facility relied upon the claimant for their care, but the claimant was neglectful. The claimant could have properly performed her duties, but chose to not do so. The Board places little significance upon the claimant's self-serving denials and upon the denials of her witness, who was discharged for the same reason.

The Board notes that while all hearing examiners are expected to follow the same procedures in conducting hearings and considering evidence, there is sometimes unexplained variance. Additionally, each case must be adjudicated on its own merits without reference to or dependency on another case. Here, although this case and another were essentially identical, they remain independent for these purposes, and each case must be separately proved.

The Board also notes that the employer should have been aware of its responsibility to provide a copy of the video for inclusion in the hearing record as that information is contained on the Notice of Hearing.


The Board lastly 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 January 13, 2013, and until the claimant becomes re-employed, earns at least twenty times their weekly benefit amount and thereafter becomes unemployed through no fault of their own.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson



Clayton A. Mitchell, Sr., Associate Member

KP/MW

Copies mailed to:

LORETTA C. BOYD

ROSE HILL MANAGEMENT INC

HEART HOMES

Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION

LORETTA C BOYD

SSN #

Claimant

vs.

ROSE HILL MANAGEMENT INC

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: 1306468
Appellant: Claimant
Local Office : 64 / BALTOMETRO
CALL CENTER

April 16, 2013

For the Claimant: PRESENT , JANELL BROWN

For the Employer: PRESENT , VICKY POLECK, LISA ISAACS

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 1002 - 1002.1 (Gross/Aggravated Misconduct connected with the work), 1003 (Misconduct connected with the work) or 1001 (Voluntary Quit for good cause).

FINDINGS OF FACT

The claimant, Loretta Boyd, began working for this employer, Rose Hill Management, Inc., on April 9, 2012. At the time of separation, the claimant was working as a caregiver. The claimant last worked for the employer on January 15, 2013, before being terminated for alleged neglect of her duties.

The claimant was responsible for the care of elderly disabled residents. The claimant's responsibilities included, feeding the residents, changing any soiled linen and clothing of the residents, as well as the laundry and general cleaning of the facility. The claimant's supervisor, after viewing the footage of a videotape from a 24-hour, stationary camera, mounted in one room of the facility, believed that the claimant, during that period, had not been properly attending to the residents. The claimant was not

permitted to view the tape and was terminated due to its content, despite her protestations that she had completed her duties as assigned.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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 8-1002 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).

EVALUATION OF 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 employer had the burden to show, by a preponderance of the credible evidence, that the claimant was discharged for some degree of misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of the Maryland Unemployment Insurance Law. Ivey v. Catterton Printing Company, 441-BH-89. In the case at bar, that burden has not been met.

The claimant provided credible and convincing testimony that clearly established that she did complete the duties of her job to the best of her ability during the period in question. In addition, the claimant's witness, who worked alongside the claimant, was credible in her assertion that she and the claimant performed their duties as assigned.

The employer provided hearsay testimony based on the videotape and largely through conclusions the employer's witnesses drew based on the claimant's amount of time spent within the view or out of the view of the stationary camera. The claimant was not allowed to view the footage and the employer was unable to properly present the video as evidence in this matter due to technical issues on the employer's part. As such the employer's evidence was not sufficient to establish that the claimant committed any acts of misconduct on any level.

Accordingly, I hold that the claimant did not commit a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, a forbidden act, a dereliction of duty, or engage 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. No 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, but not for misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003. No disqualification is imposed based upon the claimant's separation from employment with the above-identified employer. The claimant is 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 Specialist is reversed.



C S Spencer, 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 May 01, 2013. 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 : April 08,2013
CH/Specialist ID: RBA8U
Seq No: 001
Copies mailed on April 16, 2013 to:
LORETTA C. BOYD
ROSE HILL MANAGEMENT INC
LOCAL OFFICE #64
HEART HOMES