

**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**

**LYNN A BEAR  
1818 MILES AVE  
MUSCATINE IA 52761**

**WEST LIBERTY FOODS  
207 W 2<sup>ND</sup> ST  
PO BOX 318  
WEST LIBERTY IA 52776**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-00530-S2T  
OC: 12/12/04 R: 04  
Claimant: Appellant (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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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 for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Lynn Bear (claimant) appealed a representative's January 6, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with West Liberty Foods (employer) for sleeping on the job. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on January 31, 2005. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Jaime Ruess, Human Resources Manager.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on February 29, 2000, as a full-time maintenance mechanic. The claimant received a copy of the employer's handbook and signed for its receipt on April 8, 2004. He received no warnings during his employment.

The claimant did not sleep well before work on December 14, 2004, because he had the flu. He also had to work on his car so that he could drive to work. On December 14, 2004, he was looking at a magazine while waiting to speak to an electrician when he fell asleep. The employer interviewed co-workers and found the claimant was asleep for more than an hour. The employer terminated the claimant for sleeping on the job.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he was not.

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). Sleeping on the job on two occasions, one year apart, can constitute job misconduct. The grounds for discharge listed under a contract of hire are irrelevant to determination of eligibility for Job Service benefits in a misconduct situation. Hurtado v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 393 N.W.2d 309 (Iowa 1986). 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 Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). The claimant was sick and fell asleep. The employer terminated the claimant for one incident of negligently falling asleep on the job. The employer has failed to provide sufficient evidence of repeated negligence or sleeping on the job which would prove job-related misconduct. Consequently the employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The representative's January 6, 2005 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

bas/sc