

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**WILLIAM J WIERSEMA**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-00798-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**ROCK-TENN CONVERTING COMPANY**  
Employer

**OC: 12/18/11  
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)**

Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the January 13, 2012, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 16, 2012. Claimant participated. Steve Brown represented the employer and presented additional testimony through Rose Duax. Exhibit Three was received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: William Wiersema was employed by Rock-Tenn Converting Company as a full-time mechanic from 1987 until December 8, 2011, when the employer discharged him for directing profanity and intimidating behavior at his immediate supervisor and for insubordination. Don Grisko, maintenance manager, was Mr. Wiersema's immediate supervisor.

The incident that prompted the discharge occurred on the morning of December 7, at the end of Mr. Wiersema's overnight shift. Mr. Grisko asked Mr. Wiersema what he had done all night. Mr. Grisko was displeased that certain tasks he wanted performed had not been completed. Mr. Wiersema threw his tool belt onto the ground, walked to where Mr. Grisko was seated, invaded Mr. Grisko's personal space in an aggressive and intimidating manner, and told Mr. Grisko to fuck off. Mr. Grisko repeatedly directed Mr. Wiersema to accompany him to the front office and Mr. Wiersema repeatedly refused. Only when Rose Duax, human resources manager, came to get Mr. Wiersema cooperate with going to the office. The employer suspended Mr. Wiersema and then discharged him the next day.

## 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 employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly

be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

An employer has the right to expect decency and civility from its employees and an employee's use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct disqualifying the employee from receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Henecke v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 533 N.W.2d 573 (Iowa App. 1995). Use of foul language can alone be a sufficient ground for a misconduct disqualification for unemployment benefits. Warrell v. Iowa Dept. of Job Service, 356 N.W.2d 587 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). An isolated incident of vulgarity can constitute misconduct and warrant disqualification from unemployment benefits, if it serves to undermine a superior's authority. Deever v. Hawkeye Window Cleaning, Inc. 447 N.W.2d 418 (Iowa Ct. App. 1989). Threats of violence in the workplace constitute misconduct that disqualifies a claimant for benefits. The employer need not wait until the employee acts upon the threat. See Henecke v. Iowa Dept. Of Job Services, 533 N.W.2d 573 (Iowa App. 1995).

The evidence in the record establishes that Mr. Wiersema directed profanity at his supervisor that directly challenged the supervisor's authority. Mr. Wiersema acted in a threatening, intimidating manner toward the supervisor. Mr. Wiersema then refused repeated reasonable directives to report to the front office. Mr. Wiersema's actions were in willful disregard of the employer's interest in maintaining a safe, civil work environment. Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Mr. Wiersema was discharged for misconduct. Accordingly, Mr. Wiersema is disqualified for benefits until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account shall not be charged for benefits paid to Mr. Wiersema.

Iowa Code section 96.3(7) provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. The overpayment recovery law was updated in 2008. See Iowa Code section 96.3(7)(b). Under the revised law, a claimant will not be required to repay an overpayment of benefits if all of the following factors are met. First, the prior award of benefits must have been made in connection with a decision regarding the claimant's separation from a particular employment. Second, the claimant must not have engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits or in connection with the Agency's initial decision to award benefits. Third, the employer must not have participated at the initial fact-finding proceeding that resulted in the initial decision to award benefits. If Workforce Development determines there has been an overpayment of benefits, the employer will not be charged for the benefits, regardless of whether the claimant is required to repay the benefits.

Because the claimant has been deemed ineligible for benefits, any benefits the claimant has received would constitute an overpayment. Accordingly, the administrative law judge will remand the matter to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's January 13, 2012, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for misconduct. The claimant is disqualified for unemployment benefits until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit allowance, provided he meets all other eligibility requirements. The employer's account will not be charged.

This matter is remanded to the Claims Division for determination of whether there has been an overpayment, the amount of the overpayment, and whether the claimant will have to repay the benefits.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/kjw