

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SHIRO REMELIIK

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-05379-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SWIFT PORK COMPANY

Employer

OC: 03/20/11

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the April 12, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on May 17, 2011. Claimant Shiro Remeliik did not respond to the hearing notice instructions to provide a telephone number for the hearing and did not participate. Aureliano Diaz, Human Resources Manager, represented the employer.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Shiro Remeliik was employed by Swift Pork Company/JBS as a full-time production worker from 2009 until February 9, 2011, when Aaron Vawter, Second-shift Human Resources Assistant, discharged from the employment. Mr. Remeliik's immediate supervisor was Rick Boucher, Ham Boning Supervisor. Mr. Vawter discharged Mr. Remeliik because Mr. Boucher had observed Mr. Remeliik twice during the shift pull the line that would stop the production line. The first time Mr. Remeliik pulled the line, the production line did not stop. The second time Mr. Remeliik pulled the line, the production line did stop. Mr. Boucher escorted Mr. Remeliik to the human resources office. When questioned, Mr. Remeliik admitted to pulling the line to stop the production line, but indicated he had done so because the line was moving too fast. The employer discharged Mr. Remeliik for hindering production.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

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. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). 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. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

The weight of the evidence fails to establish that Mr. Remeliik's conduct in stopping the line was motivated by a willful or wanton disregard of the employer's interests. The employer failed to present testimony from anyone with personal knowledge concerning the matter that triggered

the discharge. The employer had the ability to present such testimony. While the evidence indicates Mr. Remeliik took steps to momentarily stop the production line, there is insufficient evidence, and insufficiently direct and satisfactory evidence, to indicate that Mr. Remeliik's intent was to harm the employer or hinder production.

Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Mr. Remeliik was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, Mr. Remeliik is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to Remeliik.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's April 12, 2011, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/css