

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

BRENDA L CHARBONEAU
1252 SPARTON AVE
PORT ORANGE FL 32127

EXTRA CARE INC
1532 POPLAR DR
ORMOND BEACH FL 32174

MARTHA GUILLEN
PARALEGAL
COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES
128 ORANGE AVE
DAYTONA BEACH FL 32114-4310

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-00923-LT
OC 12-21-03 R 12
Claimant: Respondent (1)

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/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed a timely appeal from the January 23, 2004, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on March 24, 2004. Claimant did participate and was represented by Martha Guillen, Paralegal. Employer did participate through Wanda Capozzi.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a part-time residential cleaner/homemaker for about a month, through December 17, 2003, when she was discharged. Wanda Capozzi told claimant of her separation but did not give a reason. Claimant's was pregnant and her physician was

concerned about her working around chemicals. Her immediate supervisor, Melissa Sharp, left a message during the evening of December 15 and asked claimant to return the cleaning supplies. Claimant received the message the next morning when she was going to a doctor's appointment so she could not return the supplies at that time. Capozzi told her she was taken off the schedule and could not return to work without a doctor's note. Claimant attempted to fax the medical information on Tuesday but the fax machine was not working. She took the note to employer on Wednesday morning and brought the cleaning supplies with her. Claimant did not want to drive to the office if she was not working. Employer did not tell her she would be paid for the trip. Claimant had not been warned that her job was in jeopardy for any reason. She was in her probationary period.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be “substantial.” When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a “wrongful intent” to be disqualifying in nature. Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. Miller v. Employment Appeal Board, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988).

The question of whether the refusal to perform a specific task constitutes misconduct must be determined by evaluating both the reasonableness of the employer’s request in light of all circumstances and the employee’s reason for noncompliance. Endicott v. IDJS, 367 N.W.2d 300 (Iowa App. 1985).

Employer did not advise claimant about a deadline for returning the supplies, that she would be paid for her time, or that she was in jeopardy of losing her job. Claimant’s delay in returning the supplies due to a medical appointment was reasonable. There was no insubordination or misconduct. The employer has failed to meet its burden of proof to establish disqualifying conduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The January 23, 2004, reference 01, decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

dml/b