

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**JEFFREY R PIERCE**  
Claimant

**HUBER HAULING INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 17A-UI-08163-DG**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 01/01/17**  
**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 August 2, 2017, (reference 01) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, an in-person hearing was scheduled for and held on August 29, 2017 in Des Moines, Iowa. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Darcy Knowles, Operations Manager. Employer's Exhibits 1-2 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 July 15, 2017. Employer discharged claimant on July 17, 2017, because claimant failed to properly report an accident in accordance with employer's written policy, and because he helped reattach downed powerlines at a customer's home which placed the employer in jeopardy of litigation.

Claimant began working for employer in May, 2016 as a full-time truck driver. Claimant had received a copy of employer's written policies and rules, and he had received instructional training by employer about reporting accidents and emergency situations while at work. Claimant was instructed that the employer must be contacted in the event of an emergency, or when there is damage to company property.

On or about July 15, 2017 claimant drove employer's truck to a rural location to dump a load of material. As claimant was driving away from the dump site he accidentally caught the top of the truck bed on a power line. Claimant got out of his truck and believed that it was safe to walk around the downed lines. Claimant helped untangle employer's vehicle from the powerlines at that time.

After claimant realized what had occurred he called one of his managers to get some assistance. He was not able to get ahold of his manager at that time. The owner of the

property explained to claimant that the downed lines were connected to an electric pump that supplied water for the farmer's cattle. Claimant knew he had to do something to help the property owner. After weighing his options he decided that he would come back and help the farmer fix the power lines later that same day.

Claimant proceeded to drive the employer's truck back to employer's lot, and he then headed back to the farm when he was no longer at work. Once he arrived back at the location of the accident claimant helped the farmer reconnect the downed power lines. Claimant did not have permission from the employer to engage in that kind of work, and claimant was not a certified electrician.

### **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:

**(8) Past acts of misconduct.** While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. The Iowa Supreme Court has opined that one unexcused absence is not misconduct even when it followed nine other excused absences and was in violation of a direct order. *Sallis v. EAB*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that the absences must be both excessive and unexcused. The Iowa Supreme Court has held that the term “excessive” is more than one. Three incidents of tardiness or absenteeism after a warning has been held to be misconduct. *Clark v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa Ct. App. 1982). While three is a reasonable interpretation of “excessive” based on current case law and Webster’s Dictionary, the interpretation is best derived from the facts presented.

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.*

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 August 2, 2017, (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

---

Duane L. Golden  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/scn