

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**GENIE S WASSON**  
Claimant

**SHEARERS FOODS BURLINGTON LLC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 21A-UI-04137-ED-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 11/08/20**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the January 7, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon her discharge from employment for job related misconduct. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 5, 2021. The claimant, Genie S. Wasson, participated personally. The employer, Shearers Food, did not participate. No exhibits were received into the record.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?  
Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as a packer. Claimant was employed from October 25, 2019 until October 2020. Claimant was discharged due to attendance issues. Claimant denies having any attendance issues.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

As a preliminary matter, I find that Claimant did not quit. Claimant was discharged from employment.

Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. 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. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r.871-24.32(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.

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). 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. 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).

What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). 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.

Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus of the administrative code definition of misconduct is on deliberate, intentional or culpable acts by the employee. *Id.* When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. *Henry v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Further, poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000)(fact that claimant, who was a snowplower, had two accidents involving utility lines within three days did not constitute misconduct such as would disqualify claimant from receiving unemployment benefits; there was no evidence that claimant intentionally or deliberately damaged utility lines or violated any traffic laws, and there was uncontroverted evidence that accidents were beyond claimant's control).

In this case there was no final act of misconduct that the claimant committed that would disqualify her from receiving benefits. The employer did not prove that claimant was in violation of any rule or policy. Claimant denied that she had attendance issues. The employer did not testify and no written statements were submitted by any employer witnesses.


To establish misconduct that will disqualify employee from unemployment compensation benefits, employer must prove conduct by employee consisted of deliberate acts or omissions or evinced such carelessness as to indicate wrongful intent. It should not be accepted as a given fact that an employer's subjective standards set the measure of proof necessary to establish misconduct; to do so skews procedure, forcing employees to prove that they are not capable of doing their job or that they had no intent to commit misconduct, thereby impermissibly shifting the burden from employer to employee. *Kelly v. Iowa Dept. of Job Service*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa App. 1986).

The employer has failed to prove that the claimant acted in any deliberate way to breach the duties of obligations of her employment contract. There was no willful or wanton action or omission of claimant which was a deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of claimant. The employer failed to prove claimant acted with 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.

As such, employer has failed to prove that claimant was discharged for any current act of job-related misconduct that would disqualify her from receiving benefits. Benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The January 7, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.



---

Emily Drenkow Carr  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax (515)478-3528

April 8, 2021  
Decision Dated and Mailed

ed/scn

NOTE TO CLAIMANT: You may find additional information about food, housing, and other resources by dialing 211 or at <https://dhs.iowa.gov/node/3250>