

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**JANET D BEAL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-08266-M2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**C V K CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 05/15/11  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated June 14, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on July 27, 2011. Claimant participated and had T. J. Henderson testify. Employer participated by Vincent Copple. Employer's Exhibits A-B, and Claimant's Exhibits 1-4 were received into evidence for the record.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct or quit with good cause attributable to the employer.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was discharged on May 18, 2011 by Office Manager Hope Harrelson after the claimant had received a poor evaluation. The employer asserted that the claimant quit following the evaluation by being a three-day no-call/no-show. However, the claimant's credible testimony was supported by documentary evidence of phone records and a vacation payout (not to be made for a quit during the period of the alleged quit per employer's policy) that collaborate her version of events. Also the office manager did not testify.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.5-1 provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

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(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the 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.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant was discharged following a poor evaluation for reasons not known on this record. Also the alleged discharger did not testify although the employer knew prior to hearing that this was a discharge was the claimant's version. When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. Crosser v. Iowa Dep't of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated June 14, 2011, reference 01, is reversed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

Stan McElderry  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

srm/css