

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JAMIE LOVELL
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-00586-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WESLEY RETIREMENT SERVICES INC
Employer

**OC: 12/12/10
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Jamie Lovell (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated January 13, 2011, reference 01, which held that she was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because she voluntarily quit her employment with Wesley Retirement Services, Inc. (employer) without good cause attributable to the employer. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 7, 2011. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer provided a telephone number but was not available when that number was called for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a part-time certified nurse assistant from September 20, 2010 through December 14, 2010. She reported to work on December 13, 2010 at 7:00 a.m. and had a panic/anxiety attack at 7:35 a.m. The claimant tried to contact the nurse scheduler but was unsuccessful. She was unable to stay at work, so she notified the registered nurse on duty, who was the acting supervisor, that she was leaving. The claimant went home and took her anxiety medication.

The assistant director of nursing later called the claimant to find out what happened and why. The claimant explained the situation to her and the assistant director of nursing told the claimant she was a valued employee and asked her to return to work on the following morning. The claimant agreed and she began work on December 14, 2010 at 7:00 a.m. After three hours, the director of nursing called her to the office and told her she was not going to return to work after she walked off the job. The director of nursing told the claimant she was not a "good fit." No disciplinary warnings had been issued to the claimant prior to her termination.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the reasons for the claimant's separation from employment qualify her to receive unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if she voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to the employer or if the employer discharged her for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §§ 96.5-1 and 96.5-2-a.

Rule 871 IAC 24.25 provides that, in general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The claimant was consistent in expressing her wish to return to work with the employer by actually returning to work on December 14, 2010. A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980).

Where a claimant walked off the job without permission before the end of his shift saying he wanted a meeting with management the next day, the Iowa Court of Appeals ruled this was not a voluntary quit because the claimant's expressed desire to meet with management was evidence that he wished to maintain the employment relationship. Such cases must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. EAB*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa App. 1992). The claimant did not exhibit the intent to quit and did not act to carry it out. Since the claimant did not have the requisite intent necessary to sever the employment relationship so as to treat the separation as a "voluntary quit" for unemployment insurance purposes, it must be treated as a discharge.

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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa 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. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Employment Appeal Board*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988).

When misconduct is alleged as the reason for the discharge and subsequent disqualification of benefits, it is incumbent upon the employer to present evidence in support of its allegations. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. 871 IAC 24.32(4). The employer did not participate in the hearing and failed to provide any evidence. The evidence provided by the claimant does not rise to the level of job misconduct as that term is defined in the above stated Administrative Rule. The employer failed to meet its burden. Work-connected misconduct has not been established in this case and benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated January 13, 2011, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw