

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

PATTI S ALLEN

Claimant

THE SALVATION ARMY

Employer

APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-12969-ST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 09/30/12

Claimant: Appellant (2)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed a department decision dated October 18, 2012, reference 01, that held she was discharged for misconduct on September 6, 2012, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on November 29, 2012. The claimant, and employee-witness, Emily Langridge, participated. The employer did not participate.

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 witnesses, and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant began employment as a part-time clerk on June 13, 2012, and last worked for the employer on September 5. The claimant had been issued a written warning for an incident with the assistant manager.

The employer terminated claimant on September 5 stating she was not a good fit the business. It also made reference to claimant being a 90-day probationary employee.

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 failed to establish claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment on September 5, 2012. The employer failed to participate in this hearing an offer evidence of job disqualifying misconduct.

DECISION:

The department decision dated October 18, 2012 reference 01 is reversed. The claimant was not discharged for misconduct on September 5, 2012. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/css