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

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-02815-MT
OC: 02/12/06   R: 04
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.

LARRY S SALISBURY
608 21ST ST
BETTENDORF IA 52722-5010

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.

MISSISSIPPI BEND AREA EDUCATION
AGENCY NO 9
729 21ST ST
BETTENDORF IA 52722

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
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 28, 2006, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on March 29, 2006. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Denise Zimmer, Head of Environmental and Facility Services; Jason Rupe, Maintenance and Grounds Keeper; Karen Jensen, Learning Center Assistant; Lisa Wulf, Payroll Insurance Agent; and Tom Wirtz, Director or Administrative Services. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for the employer February 1, 2006.

Employer discharged claimant on February 1, 2006 because claimant made an off-color remark to several female employees. Claimant believed it as a joke. Claimant did not believe it would be offensive or in violation of the harassment policy. Claimant had no prior formal warnings for harassment. Claimant was talked to about harassment but not told he would be discharged on the next offense.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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).

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

> (8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has failed to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated the employer's policy concerning harassment. Claimant was not warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct because claimant did not intentionally violate the policy. Claimant did not understand that his joke or play on words would be in violation of policy. This is not an intentional act. There are no prior final warnings to help establish this as an intentional violation of a known company rule. As such, this is an isolated instance of poor judgment. Therefore, claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated February 28, 2006, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

mdm\kkf