

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

LEIDI C SILVA
313 N ASH
OTTUMWA IA 52501

CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-11781-SWT
OC: 10/16/05 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (2)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge
Section 96.3-7 - Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated November 4, 2005, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on December 6, 2005. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing with the assistance of interpreter, Ike Rocha. Mindy Hadley participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as a production worker from February 7, 2005, to October 18, 2005. The claimant was informed and understood that under the employer's

work rules, meat that had dropped from the line was not to be picked up and put back on the line. The claimant had never received any discipline regarding this work rule prior to the incident on October 18.

On October 18, 2005, the claimant accidentally dropped some meat on the floor. The claimant picked the meat up and put it back on the line. The claimant picked up the meat because she was afraid that she would get into trouble for dropping it. A supervisor observed what the claimant had done. The employer discharged the claimant from employment for violating the employer's sanitation policy.

The claimant filed for and received a total of \$877.00 in unemployment insurance benefits for the weeks between October 16 and November 12, 2005.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:
 - a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

- a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The claimant's violation of a known work rule was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case. The law distinguishes between willful misconduct and negligent misconduct. Dropping the meat on the floor was negligent, but picking the meat off the floor and putting it on the line was deliberate. The claimant may have been motivated by fear of getting into trouble, but that does not excuse her deliberate violation of the employer's sanitation policies.

The next issue in this case is whether the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

As a result of this decision, the claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits and was overpaid \$877.00 in benefits for the weeks between October 16 and November 12, 2005.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated November 4, 2005, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits until she has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant was overpaid \$877.00 in unemployment insurance benefits, which must be repaid.

saw/tjc