

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

HELEN R THOMAS
644 S 10TH ST
ESTHERVILLE IA 51334

GOOD SAMARITAN SOCIETY INC
c/o FRICK UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-02271-MT
OC: 01/23/05 R: 01
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 for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 25, 2005, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on April 7, 2005. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Bruce Radtke, Administrator; Denise Leal, Human Resource Director; and Mary Hayenga, Dietary Supervisor. Exhibits A and One were 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 January 18, 2005.

Employer discharged claimant on January 25, 2005 because claimant allegedly refused to help clean a dining room. Claimant called and asked for help. Claimant was told to help clean the dining room. At the time of the call, there was only one person to clear the second dining room. Claimant asked for help because there was only one person. The second person returned shortly to help clear the room, which allowed claimant to do dishes. Claimant was exhausted, as she had been doing additional work for five weeks due to a change in job description and duties. This had placed more stress on claimant. Finally, claimant went back and did her dishes as two co-workers were cleaning the dining room.

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 insubordination. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge fails to constitute misconduct because claimant did perform her work as needed. Claimant was told to help clean up the dining room, but the second worker returned which allowed claimant to go about her duties washing dishes. Claimant did not act in a manner inconsistent with her job and the best interest of employer. Claimant was rather rude when calling her supervisor but such does not amount to misconduct, as it was not intentional. Claimant did not use any inappropriate language when conversing with her supervisor. 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 25, 2005, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

mdm\sc