

**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**

**SABAHUDIN RIZVANOVIC
3779 W 9TH ST APT 10
WATERLOO IA 50702**

**TYSON FRESH MEATS INC
C/o FRICK UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283**

**Appeal Number: 04A-UI-03123-H2T
OC 02-15-04 R 03
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

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
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the March 9, 2004, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on April 19, 2004. The claimant did participate through the interpretation of Zeljka Krvavica. The employer did participate through Dave Duncan, Complex Human Resources Manager. 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 an hourly production worker on the A shift kill floor full time beginning April 9, 2002 through February 19, 2004 when he was discharged.

On February 12, 2004, the claimant went into the production area with dirty equipment. The claimant's steel, a tool he uses to sharpen his knife, was still dirty from the day before. The claimant's supervisor recorded that on the daily supervisor's log and told the claimant that he would receive a step of disciplinary warning. The claimant had been disciplined previously for sanitation issues. The sanitation rules are a part of the company rules as well as part of government regulation the employer is required to comply with to provide a safe edible product to the public. The employer's policy requires that before the equipment is taken off the floor, it must be cleaned and sanitized. The equipment must also be cleaned and sanitized in the morning prior to the claimant beginning his shift. The supervisor is required to check the equipment, including the steel, every day before the claimant begins working.

The claimant has a previous history of discipline that includes a January 9, 2004 written warning and day's suspension for chewing gum on the production floor; an October 8, 2003 warning for wearing a necklace on the production floor and a September 25, 2003 written warning for chewing gum on the floor.

The claimant has claimed and received unemployment insurance benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related 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).

An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's rights by failing to follow the sanitation requirements required by the employer and by the federal government. The employer has an obligation to produce a product that is fit for human consumption, as such they have specific requirements for the claimant and the equipment they use. The claimant appeared for work with a steel that was not clean. He was sent back by the inspector to have his steel sanitized and after having his steel sanitized the claimant began working. The claimant's disregard of the employer's sanitization policy is misconduct. As such, the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code Section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The March 9, 2004, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,903.00.

tkh/kjf