

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**RANDALL P HULLINGER
PO BOX 23
KELLERTON IA 50133**

**PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES INC
512 N 4TH ST
RED OAK IA 51566**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-04312-AT
OC: 12-05-04 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Professional Resources, Inc. filed a timely appeal from an unemployment insurance decision dated April 14, 2005, reference 03, which allowed benefits to Randall P Hullinger. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held May 17, 2005 with Mr. Hullinger participating. Staffing Manager Monica Bartlett participated for the employer. Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Randall P. Hullinger was employed by Professional Resources, Inc., a temporary employment agency, from February 15, 2005 until he was discharged March 8, 2005. He worked on assignment at Gits Manufacturing producing parts used in pistons. Mr. Hullinger produced approximately 900 parts per day with an error rate of six to eight parts per day. He was discharged on March 8, 2005 because his error rate was unacceptable. The error rate remained the same even after additional training.

Mr. Hullinger had no background in manufacturing. His prior 20 years of employment was in law enforcement.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the evidence in the record establishes that Mr. Hullinger was discharged for misconduct. It does not.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof. See Iowa Code section 96.6-2. Poor performance due to inability is not misconduct. See 871 IAC 24.32(1) set forth above. The employer has not established that Mr. Hullinger's errors were careless or deliberate. The administrative law judge notes that the employment lasted for a total of three weeks and that the claimant had no prior experience in this type of work. In addition, the employer was unable to establish any point in time in which Mr. Hullinger's performance was satisfactory. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated April 14, 2005, reference 03, is affirmed. The claimant is entitled to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible.

tjc/sc