

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

NICHOLAS J CRNIC
Claimant

BRIDGES OF IOWA
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-09197-NM-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 08/13/17
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the September 1, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon his discharge for leaving work without the employer's permission. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 26, 2017. The claimant participated and testified. The employer participated through Executive Director Patrick Coughlin and Assistant Clinical Director Michelle Cross. Also present on behalf of the employer, but not testifying were Krista Pederson and Angie Rodberg. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 9 were received into evidence.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as a counselor from November 25, 2013, until this employment ended on August 10, 2017, when he was discharged.

At the beginning of his shift on August 9, 2017, claimant was presented with a written warning by Pederson and Cross. (Exhibit 5). Claimant was upset by the warning and over the next several hours spoke to Pederson about it several times. Pederson left for the day at 4:30 p.m., prior to claimant's shift ending. Cross was working in the building for the remainder of claimant's shift. At 5:16 p.m. claimant sent Cross a text message informing her that he was not feeling well, that the write-up had made him nauseous and shaky, and he was going home. (Exhibit 1). Claimant testified he has diagnosed anxiety and the stress from the written warning had caused him to have a panic attack. Claimant did not make any attempts to locate Cross or speak to her in person. When Cross received claimant's message, approximately ten minutes later, she went and asked the front desk and his coworker if he had already left. Claimant's coworker indicated he had already gone. The decision was subsequently made to discharge claimant from employment for leaving work without notifying a supervisor.

The employer has a policy in place which requires employees to either speak to a supervisor personally or via telephone if they are going to be absent from work or need to leave work early.

Claimant received a copy of this policy upon his hire. Additionally, Cross testified there had been a prior incident where claimant had sent her an email stating he would be absent and she had told him that he needed to communicate his absences either in person or on the phone. No formal disciplinary action was issued following this incident and claimant was not warned his job would be in jeopardy if it happened again. Claimant did not recall this conversation. Claimant had no other disciplinary action related to his attendance or leaving work early without permission from a supervisor.

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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). 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).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

Claimant was discharged after he left work early without properly notifying his supervisor. The conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment. A claimant will not be disqualified if the employer shows only "inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances." 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a). Claimant should have made more of an effort to notify his supervisor of his situation and that he needed to leave work early. Claimant was careless, but the carelessness does not indicate "such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design" such that it could accurately be called misconduct. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)(a); *Greenwell v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, No. 15-0154 (Iowa Ct. App. Mar. 23, 2016).

Claimant had received no prior warnings or disciplinary action for leaving work early or failing to properly notify a supervisor as such. An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. Training or general notice to staff about a policy is not considered a disciplinary warning. Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about the issue leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning.

DECISION:

The September 1, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Nicole Merrill
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

nm/rvs