

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**PAUL L CONES II**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-02332-DT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**KELLY SERVICES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 12/31/06 R: 03  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Paul L. Cones II (claimant) appealed a representative's February 23, 2007 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment with Kelly Services, Inc. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 26, 2007. The claimant participated in the hearing. Nancy Foelker appeared on the employer's behalf. During the hearing, Employer's Exhibit One was entered into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The employer is a temporary employment firm. After a prior period of employment with the employer in 2003 and 2004, the claimant resumed taking assignments with the employer on June 12, 2006; the assignment he began at that time became his final assignment to date. He worked full time as a warehouse packager with the employer's Cedar Rapids, Iowa, business client on a 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m., Monday through Friday schedule. His last day on the assignment was January 2, 2007. The assignment ended because the employer determined that the claimant was not properly reporting separately to the employer's representative when he would be away from the assignment.

In early December 2006, the claimant had been absent from work one day and had called the contact at the business client location but had not called his supervisor with the employer's office, Ms. Foelker. He was warned at that time that as he had agreed to upon accepting the assignment that he would notify both the contact at the business client and Ms. Foelker "when and why" he would be gone. On December 21, the claimant had an afternoon appointment which he reported to the on-site contact but did not report to Ms. Foelker; he left the worksite at approximately 2:45 p.m. and returned at approximately 4:00 p.m. and continued working until approximately 5:45 p.m., as the staff was working additional hours at that time.

Ms. Foelker was aware even as of December 21 that the claimant had left the client business premises without notifying her. However, even though the claimant worked on December 22 and the following week, no action was taken with regard to the claimant until January 2, 2007. At that time the employer and business client reviewed the claimant's record in conjunction with the client's needs, and the decision was made to terminate the claimant's assignment because of his failure to notify Ms. Foelker, as well as an argument between the claimant and a coworker in October 2006.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The question is not whether the employer was right to terminate the claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate matters. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988).

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.

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 focus of the definition of misconduct is on acts or omissions by a claimant that “rise to the level of being deliberate, intentional or culpable.” Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The acts must show:

1. Willful and wanton disregard of an employer’s interest, such as found in:
  - a. Deliberate violation of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of its employees, or
  - b. Deliberate disregard of standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of its employees; or
2. Carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to:
  - a. Manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design; or
  - b. Show an intentional and substantial disregard of:
    1. The employer’s interest, or
    2. The employee’s duties and obligations to the employer.

Henry, supra. The final incident cited by the employer as the reason for discharging the claimant is his failure to call Ms. Foelker on December 21 to inform her he would be off the client’s jobsite for slightly over an hour for an appointment. The employer has not established that this isolated occurrence which he did report to the on-site representative was substantial misbehavior, as compared to inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, inadvertence, or ordinary negligence in an isolated instance, or a good faith error in judgment or discretion. Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Further, there is no current act of misconduct as required to establish work-connected misconduct. 871 IAC 24.32(8); Greene v. Employment Appeal Board, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa App. 1988). The incident in question occurred about twelve days prior to the employer’s discharge of the claimant. The employer has not met its burden to show disqualifying misconduct. Cosper, supra. Based upon the evidence provided, the claimant’s actions were not misconduct within the meaning of the statute, and the claimant is not disqualified from benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative’s February 23, 2007 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer did discharge the claimant but not for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

---

Lynette A. F. Donner  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/css