

**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**

**JIM PETERS
5718 VALLEY RD
AMES IA 50014**

**MARY GREELEY MEDICAL CENTER
1111 DUFF AVE
AMES IA 50010**

**NATHAN J OVERBERG
AHLERS & COONEY PC
100 COURT AVE STE 600
DES MOINES IA 50309**

**Appeal Number: 04A-UI-06093-H2T
OC 05-02-04 R 02
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/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the May 21, 2004, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on June 23, 2004. The claimant did participate and was represented by Nathan J. Overberg, Attorney at Law. The employer did participate through Jim Graham, Paramedic Supervisor and (representative) Patti Steelman, Human Resources Coordinator. Claimant's Exhibit A was received. Employer's Exhibit One was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a paramedic specialist full time beginning September 26, 1977

through May 4, 2004 when he was discharged. The claimant worked as a paramedic and as such was required to maintain a license or certification issued by the State of Iowa. To maintain his certification the claimant was required to complete class work, fill out a certification form, and pay a nominal fee. The claimant was licensed both on a national and a state level. The claimant's certification expired on March 31, 2004. The claimant had completed all of the required course work to maintain his certification at both the state and national level. The claimant mailed in his application for recertification at the national level, but just forgot to mail in his application for recertification at the state level. When the claimant was notified on April 30, 2004 that his certification had expired he immediately faxed in the application form, and sent in his fee. The claimant was recertified before May 4, 2004 when he met with the employer and was told he was discharged for working 16, 8-hour shifts without certification. The employer does not believe that the claimant intentionally failed to file his application for recertification; rather that he just forgot to mail it in. The claimant has no previous disciplinary history for any similar conduct or behavior. During the claimant's almost 26 years of employment he had never before let his certification lapse.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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 in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The employer discharged the claimant and has the burden of proof to show misconduct. 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).

The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant simply forgot to mail in his application for recertification. There was no 'intention' on the part of the claimant to let his certification lapse as is evidence by the fact that the claimant had completed all of the required course work to maintain his certification. The only reason the claimant was not certified in a timely manner was because he forgot to send in the application. His one time lapse is not substantial intentional misconduct. Thus, benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The May 21, 2004, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

tkh/kjf