

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

ASIA J LANE
Claimant

ATLANTIC BOTTLING CO
Employer

APPEAL 19R-UI-02480-DG-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 01/06/19
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 1, 2019, (reference 01) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on April 9, 2019. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Shirley Jones, Human Resources Generalist. Employer's Exhibits 1-4 and Claimant's Exhibit A were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on January 7, 2019. Employer discharged claimant on January 7, 2019, because claimant failed to follow employer's instructions after being warned on multiple occasions.

Claimant began working for employer as a merchandiser on February 23, 2016. Claimant received employer's workplace policies at the time of hire, and claimant was able to perform her job duties in a satisfactory manner. Claimant sorted soft drinks in vendors' stores. It was her job to make sure that products which had expired were removed from the stores' shelves. Claimant was liked by the staff at the stores she visited, and there were no major complaints about her work.

On July 10, 2018 claimant was given a written warning for not removing expired soft drinks from store shelves. Claimant was told that failure to perform her job as instructed would lead to further discipline. On October 11, 2018 claimant was given another written warning for similar conduct. Claimant had not sorted and removed outdated product at a store. On November 6, 2018 claimant received a written warning, and she was suspended from work for One day for the same conduct at another store.

On January 4, 2019 employer was contacted by a grocery store about problems it was having with claimant working at its store. The grocery store manager told employer that it found

outdated soft drinks on its shelves. The manager stated that he would not allow claimant to work in his store after that date.

Employer reviewed claimant's prior warnings and decided that it must terminate claimant's employment on January 7, 2019 for violating employer's policies. Claimant was notified on January 7, 2019 that her employment was being terminated effective immediately.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

The Iowa Court of Appeals found substantial evidence of misconduct in testimony that the claimant worked slower than he was capable of working and would temporarily and briefly improve following oral reprimands. *Sellers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 531 N.W.2d 645 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Failure to sign a written reprimand acknowledging receipt constitutes job misconduct as a matter of law. *Green v Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 299 N.W.2d 651 (Iowa 1980). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. *Henry v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

Claimant's repeated failure to accurately perform her job duties after having been warned is evidence of carelessness to such a degree of recurrence as to rise to the level of disqualifying job related misconduct. Employer did provide sufficient evidence of deliberate conduct in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. Claimant's conduct does evince such willful or wanton disregard of 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. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The February 1, 2019, (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Duane L. Golden
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/scn