

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

PATTY ARREDONDO
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-10368-ST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ACH FOOD CO INC
Employer

OC: 06/14/09
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge
871 IAC 24.32(1) – Definition of Misconduct
871 IAC 24.16(7) – Late Call

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed a department decision dated July 14, 2009, reference 01, that held she was discharged for misconduct on June 12, 2009, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on August 5, 2009. The claimant did not participate. William Nelson, HR/Securities Manager, participated for the employer.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge having heard the testimony of the witness, and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant began employment as a full-time order picker in the warehouse on June 25, 2007, and last worked for the employer on June 12, 2009. The claimant was issued a first suspension (one day) and final warning on May 27, 2009 by HR Manager Nelson for a work performance error regarding a customer order. Nelson put the claimant on notice that a further incident would result in termination from employment.

The employer discharged the claimant on June 12, 2009 for a work performance error that was the miss-picking of a customer order. Since this was the second suspension in accord with the employer's progressive disciplinary policy, the claimant was discharged from employment. The union grievance to re-instate the claimant has been denied.

The claimant called-in after the close of the record and she had failed to note the hearing instructions to provide a number in advance of the hearing.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer has established that the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment on June 12, 2009, for repeated work performance errors in light of progressive discipline.

The claimant knew the employer policy due to a prior, final warning and suspension, and her repeated violation for the same offense constitutes job disqualifying misconduct.

871 IAC 26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals section with the names and telephone numbers of its witnesses by the scheduled time of the hearing, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

At issue is a request to reopen the record made after the hearing had concluded. The request to reopen the record is denied because the party making the request failed to participate by reading and following the instructions on the hearing notice.

The claimant failed to offer a good cause to re-open the record.

DECISION:

The department decision dated July 14, 2009, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for misconduct on June 12, 2009. Benefits are denied until the claimant requalifies by working in and being paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/pjs