

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**RYAN J BENNIEN**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-03236-MT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**SWIFT & COMPANY**

Employer

**OC: 03/11/07 R: 02  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated March 26, 2008, reference 04, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on April 16, 2008. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Tony Luse, Employment Manager. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on February 27, 2008.

Claimant was discharged on March 4, 2008 by employer because claimant threw a piece of meat at an employee. The meat was the size of a quarter. Claimant threw the meat to get the employees attention because she was chewing gum. Claimant wanted the employee to eliminate the gum as it was a hazard to quality and meat safety. Claimant had no warnings on his record. Claimant did not know he would be discharged on the first offense for throwing meat.

**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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning safety. Claimant was not warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct because this is a single isolated instance of poor judgment on a clean record of employment. The single incident of throwing meat is not misconduct. The absence of a prior warning detracts from a finding of intentional conduct. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated March 26, 2008, reference 04, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

Marlon Mormann  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/pjs