IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

JESSE J KOTTRA Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-09401-S2-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

LEWIS MACHINE & TOOL CO Employer

OC: 04/05/20 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the March 31, 2021, (reference 04) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits on the basis of insubordination. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 17, 2021. Claimant Jesse J. Kottra participated. Employer Lewis Machine & Tool Co. did not register for the hearing and did not participate.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as an assembler from June 1, 2019, until March 17, 2021, when he was discharged.

On March 17, 2021, claimant needed to replace a piece for a fixture used in his job, so he visited the engineering department. While claimant spoke to an engineer, his supervisor approached him and asked what he was doing there. Claimant explained about the piece he needed, and his supervisor told him that going forward claimant needed to let him know whenever he was away from his post. Claimant agreed, although he had never done this in the past. Claimant also reminded his supervisor how frequently he needed to leave his post for various tasks and his supervisor stated that was fine. A short time later, claimant had his fixture operational and went to retrieve some paperwork. When he opened his door, claimant saw his supervisor standing approximately 20 feet away, so he hollered to him that he was going to go get his paperwork and would be away from his post for a moment. When he returned to his post his supervisor came up and asked him why he had an attitude. Claimant did not believe he had an attitude towards his supervisor. Approximately 15 minutes later, a human resources representative took claimant into her office and terminated his employment. When he asked her why, she told him, "You know why."

Claimant received no prior disciplinary action during his employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the

employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

An employee's failure to perform a specific task may not constitute misconduct if such failure is in good faith or for good cause. See Woods v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 327 N.W.2d 768, 771 (Iowa 1982). "[W]illful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey the reasonable instructions of his employer." Myers v. IDJS, 373 N.W.2d 507, 510 (Iowa 1983) (quoting Sturniolo v. Commonwealth, Unemployment Compensation Bd. of Review, 19 Cmwlth. 475, 338 A.2d 794, 796 (1975)); Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679, 680 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

In insubordination cases, the reasonableness of the employer's demand in light of the circumstances must be evaluated, along with the worker's reason for non-compliance. See *Endicott v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 367 N.W.2d 300 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). The key to such cases is not the worker's subjective point of view but "what a reasonable person would have believed under the circumstances." *Aalbers v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 431 N.W.2d 330, 337 (Iowa 1988); *accord O'Brien v. EAB*, 494 N.W.2d 660 (Iowa 1993)(objective good faith is test in quits for good cause). For example, in *Green v. IDJS*, 299 N.W.2d 651 (Iowa 1980) an employee refused to sign a warning to acknowledge that she understood why she was being warned. The Court found the refusal to be disqualifying as a matter of Iaw, and did not focus on whether the warning was justified or not. *Green* at 655. The claimant's actions in refusing to do as told "show[ed] an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer." 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a).

"[W]illful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey the reasonable instructions of his employer." *Myers v. IDJS*, 373 N.W.2d 507, 510 (Iowa 1983).

No evidence was presented that claimant received any warnings about his conduct or that he was careless or engaged in a pattern of negligence. There is no evidence of insubordination by claimant. Employer has not met its burden of proving disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The March 31, 2021, (reference 04) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Stephaned alkesson

Stephanie Adkisson Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

<u>June 30, 2021</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

sa/mh