

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct? Is the claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits by being able and available for work?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

After a prior period of employment with the employer, the claimant most recently began working for the employer on November 22, 2004. She worked full time as a production worker at the employer's business client. Her last day of work was August 1, 2005. The employer discharged her on that date. The reason asserted for the discharge was failing to have the necessary work documentation in order to be hired by the client as a permanent employee.

The claimant is not a United States citizen. She claims to be a resident alien, and that she had been granted a social security card. However, when the employer's client requested documentation, the claimant indicated that the documentation had been lost. As of the date of the hearing, the claimant had not recovered or replaced the documentation, although she has initiated steps for obtaining replacements.

The claimant established a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective August 28, 2005. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits after the separation from employment in the amount of \$1,194.00.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The initial issue in this case is whether the employer discharged the claimant for reasons establishing work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. The issue is not whether the employer was right to terminate the claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate questions. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988).

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

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 focus of the definition of misconduct is on acts or omissions by a claimant that "rise to the level of being deliberate, intentional or culpable." Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The acts must show:

1. Willful and wanton disregard of an employer's interest, such as found in:
 - a. Deliberate violation of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of its employees, or
 - b. Deliberate disregard of standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of its employees; or
2. Carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to:
 - a. Manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design; or
 - b. Show an intentional and substantial disregard of:
 1. The employer's interest, or
 2. The employee's duties and obligations to the employer.

Henry, supra. The reason cited by the employer for discharging the claimant is her failure to have possession of the necessary documentation, which the employer should have requested of her before placing her on the assignment. Under the circumstances of this case, although the employer had no choice but to end her assignment, the claimant's failure to have the documentation was a good faith error in judgment or discretion. The employer has not met its burden to show disqualifying misconduct. Cosper, supra. Based upon the evidence provided, the claimant's actions were not misconduct within the meaning of the statute, and the claimant is not disqualified from benefits.

The underlying issue in this case is whether the claimant is currently eligible for unemployment insurance benefits by being able and available for employment.

Iowa Code section 96.4-3 provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Code section 96.5-10 provides:

10. Aliens—disqualified. For services performed by an alien unless such alien is an individual who was lawfully admitted for permanent residence at the time such services were performed, was lawfully present for the purpose of performing such services, or was permanently residing in the United States under color of law at the time such services were performed, including an alien who is lawfully present in the United States as a result of the application of the provisions of section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Any data or information required of individuals applying for benefits to determine whether benefits are not payable to them because of their alien status shall be uniformly required from all applicants for benefits. In the case of an individual whose application for benefits would otherwise be approved, no determination that benefits to such individual are not payable because of the individual's alien status shall be made except upon a preponderance of the evidence.

871 IAC 24.60(2) provides:

Alien. Any person who is not a citizen or a national of the United States. A national is defined as a person who lives in mandates or trust territories administered by the United States and owes permanent allegiance to the United States. An alien is a person owing allegiance to another country or government.

(2) It is required that information designed to identify illegal nonresident aliens shall be requested of all claimants for benefits. This shall be accomplished by asking each claimant at the time the individual establishes a benefit year whether or not the individual is a citizen.

a. If the response is "yes," no further proof is necessary and the claimant's records are to be marked accordingly.

b. If the answer is "no," the claimant shall be requested to present documentary proof of legal residency. Any individual who does not show proof of legal residency at the time it is requested shall be disqualified from receiving benefits until such time as the required proof of the individual's status is brought to the local office. The principal documents showing legal entry for permanent residency are the Form I-94 "Arrival and Departure Record" and the Forms I-151 and I-551 "Alien Registration Receipt Card." These forms are issued by the immigration and naturalization service and should be accepted unless the proof is clearly faulty or there are reasons to doubt their authenticity. An individual

will be required to provide the individual's alien registration number at the time of claim filing.

The claimant has not presented evidence of legal residency or permit to work. Benefits are denied until such evidence is presented. The matter will be remanded for an investigation and preliminary determination on that issue.

DECISION:

The representative's September 28, 2005 decision (reference 01) is modified in favor of the employer. The employer did discharge the claimant but not for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if she is otherwise eligible. However, she is not able and available for work. Benefits are denied as of August 28, 2005 until or unless the documentation issue is resolved. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for further review of the documentation issue. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,194.00.

ld/kjf