

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

MICHAEL L MCNARY
RT 2 BOX 51
LANCASTER MO 63548

EXCEL CORPORATION
c/o FRICK UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-02509-BT
OC: 01/30/05 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (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:

Michael McNary (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 25, 2005, reference 01, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from Excel Corporation (employer) for work-connected misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 29, 2005. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Adriana Cobos, Human Resources Associate.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time production worker from April 19, 2004 through November 3, 2004. He was discharged for non-compliance with substance abuse treatment for alcohol usage, which was a condition of his continuing employment. The claimant was aware his successful completion of treatment was required in order to maintain employment. He was required to attend four treatment sessions. The first appointment on September 15, 2004 had to be rescheduled for September 27, 2004. His next appointment was September 29, 2004 and that was rescheduled for September 30, 2004 but the claimant was a no-show. The claimant called the union on October 6, 2004 and verbalized understanding that if he failed to show or call ahead of time for a treatment session, he would be discharged. He was also reminded that he was required to bring the applicable paperwork to his treatment sessions. He was 30 minutes late for his session on October 7, 2004 and he failed to show for the fourth treatment session on October 14, 2004 even though he did call 90 minutes after the fact. The claimant went to the union on October 28, 2004 smelling of alcohol and was subsequently discharged.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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 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 claimant was discharged for his failure to complete substance abuse treatment for alcoholism, which was a condition of his continued employment. He knew he was required to complete treatment and knew he was required to provide the proper paperwork but failed to do both. The claimant's failure to complete treatment was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 25, 2005, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

sdb/pjs