

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**NATHAN S DIX**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-01366-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**TYSON FRESH MEATS INC**  
Employer

**OC: 01/04/09 R: 03**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Nathan Dix (claimant) appealed a representative's January 27, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he voluntarily quit work with Tyson Fresh Meats (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for February 16, 2009. The claimant participated personally. The employer notified the administrative law judge that it did not wish to participate in the hearing.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**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 hired in August 2008, as a full-time forklift driver. The claimant received the employer's handbook. The handbook states that an employee will be terminated if he accumulates 14 attendance points. The employer did not issue the claimant any warnings during his employment.

On December 29, 2008, the claimant suffered a work-related wrist injury. The claimant asked his supervisor permission to leave work at 12:25 a.m. to pick up his sibling. The supervisor granted the claimant's request. On December 30, 2008, the claimant properly reported to the employer that he could not work due to his work injury. On December 31, 2008, the claimant properly reported he had transportation issues. The claimant was not scheduled to work on January 1, 2009.

On January 2, 2009, the claimant reported for work. At approximately 5:30 p.m. the employer terminated the claimant. The employer told the claimant he abandoned his job. The claimant had accumulated eight attendance points.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not 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.

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). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). The employer did not participate in the hearing and, therefore, provided no evidence of job-related misconduct. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The representative's January 27, 2009 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css