

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DENNIS L MILLER
Claimant

WEST LIBERTY FOODS LLC
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-01459-NM-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 01/17/16
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the February 2, 2017, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon his discharge for leaving work without permission. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 2, 2017. The claimant participated and testified. The employer participated through Human Resource Supervisor Nikki Bruno and Production Supervisor Angel Montelongo.

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 SP Operator from January 25, 2016, until this employment ended on January 5, 2017, when he was discharged.

On January 5, 2017, claimant was operating the Line 1 Bolt System, which involved dumping product into a blender. The machine had a door, which was supposed to be closed during dumping to prevent an overflow of meat product. Claimant forgot to close the door causing 406 pounds of meat product to fall onto the floor. Claimant then went on break rather than cleaning up the meat. According to the employer claimant was asked by his lead, Shayan Aponte, to clean up the meat before going on break. Montelongo testified cleaning up such messes as quickly as possible is very important in order to prevent cross-contamination and bacteria growth. He further testified all employees go through training on proper sanitization each year.

Claimant testified he was not aware that he needed to immediately clean up the mess and thought he would be able to take care of it after his break. Claimant explained he usually works in a different area where the practice is to shovel spills under the line to clean up later. The employer acknowledged this was the practice in the area claimant was referring to, but noted those spills are much smaller. Claimant denied Aponte ever told him to clean up the meat

before going on break and testified that if he had, claimant would have followed his instructions. According to claimant he walked past Aponte twice on his way to break and nothing was said to indicate he should not go on break or that he needed to clean up the mess right away.

Prior to this incident claimant had received no prior disciplinary action. The employer did provide testimony about an unrelated incident, occurring on December 30, 2016, in which claimant left work without clocking out, and for which he was going to be disciplined, but the January 5 incident occurred before that discipline could be issued. Both parties agree claimant was not going to be terminated based on the December 30 incident.

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 decision in this case rests, at least in part, on the credibility of the witnesses. It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The Iowa Supreme Court has ruled that if a party has the power to produce more explicit and direct evidence than it chooses to present, the administrative law judge may infer that evidence not presented would reveal deficiencies in the party's case. *Crosser v. Iowa Dep't of Pub. Safety*, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976). The employer did not present a witness with direct knowledge of the situation. No request to continue the hearing was made and no written statement of the individual was offered. Given the serious nature of the proceeding and the employer's allegations resulting in claimant's discharge from employment, the employer's nearly complete reliance on hearsay statements is troubling. After assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, using her own common sense and experience, keeping in mind the ruling in *Crosser*, *id.*, and noting that the claimant presented direct, first-hand testimony while the employer relied upon second-hand reports, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant's recollection of the events is more credible than that of the employer.

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.

The conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment. Claimant should have cleaned up the spill prior to going on his break. 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 never been discipline or warned about similar infractions prior to January 5, 2017. 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 February 2, 2017, (reference 03) 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/