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

PATRICIA A BRANDON 616 WELLINGTON ST WATERLOO IA 50702-2118

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC <sup>c</sup>/<sub>o</sub> TALX UCM SERVICES INC PO BOX 283 ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-04575-DWT

OC: 03/19/06 R: 03 Claimant: Appellant (2)

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*, 4<sup>th</sup> 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

- The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
- 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)
( 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Patricia A. Brandon (claimant) appealed a representative's April 25, 2006 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, and the account of Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc. (employer) would not be charged because the claimant had been discharged for disqualifying reasons. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 16, 2006. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer failed to respond to the hearing notice by contacting the Appeals Section prior to the hearing and providing the phone number at which the employer's witness/representative could be contacted to participate in the hearing. As a result, no one represented the employer. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the claimant, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

## ISSUE:

Did the employer discharge the claimant for work-connected misconduct?

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on December 15, 1998. The claimant worked full time as a production worker. A co-worker, who is Bosnian, had a habit of walking past the claimant and slapping the claimant on her buttocks. The claimant did not appreciate this.

The week of March 19, 2006, the co-worker walked up to the claimant and again slapped her on the behind. The claimant told the co-worker to move back. When the co-worker did not move, the claimant did not say or do anything more to the co-worker. The claimant continued doing her work. Later, the claimant learned the co-worker reported that the claimant had pushed her, but the claimant had not.

The employer asked the claimant to write a statement of what had happened between the claimant and the co-worker. After the employer reviewed the claimant's statement, the employer discharged the claimant.

The claimant and her union grieved her termination. The employer had the claimant return to work the week of April 16, 2006.

### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer discharges her for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

For unemployment insurance purposes, misconduct amounts to a deliberate act and a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of a worker's contract of employment. Misconduct is a deliberate violation or disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has a right to expect from employees or is an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, unsatisfactory performance due to inability or incapacity, inadvertence or ordinary negligence in isolated incidents, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not deemed to constitute work-connected misconduct. 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a).

The employer may have had compelling business reasons for discharging the claimant the week of March 19, 2006. The facts presented during the hearing do not establish that the employer discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. As of March 19, 2006, the claimant is qualified to receive benefits.

# **DECISION:**

The representative's April 25, 2006 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer may have discharged the claimant for compelling businesses reasons. The facts do not, however, establish that claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. As of March 19, 2006, the claimant is qualified to receive benefits, provided she meets all other eligibility requirements. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to the claimant.

dlw/kkf