

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

PETER B CRAN
507 – 1ST AVE N
HUMBOLDT IA 50548

LYNCH LIVESTOCK INC
331 – 3RD ST NW
WAUCOMA IA 52171-9400

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-11755-SWT
OC: 12/26/04 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated November 7, 2005, reference 04, that concluded he was discharged for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on December 5, 2005. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. Angela Sickels participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with a witness, Lee Lockwood. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked as a hog buyer for the employer from January 21 to October 7, 2005. The employer discharged the claimant because: (1) his supervisor was dissatisfied with the cleanliness of the claimant's hog buying station, (2) the claimant had held hogs at his station for three days without feeding them, (3) the claimant had failed to get contact information from a

farmer who had left hogs at the buying station, (4) profits and hog sales were lower than in previous years, and (5) the employer believed the claimant had told an inspector with the Department of Agriculture that the employer did not tattoo its hogs or put back tags on sows.

The claimant performed his job to the best of his ability and never deliberately failed to perform his job duties. The employer had cautioned the claimant about overfeeding livestock. He did not feed pigs that were to be shipped out in a short time. The farmer had left the hogs without contacting the claimant or leaving his contact information. The lower profits and sales were primarily due to economic conditions, not the claimant's job performance. The claimant had not reported to the inspector that the employer was not putting back tags on sows. He did inform the inspector that butcher hogs were not being tattooed immediately because he did not know where they were going. This was not a violation of any department regulations.

The claimant filed a new claim for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of December 26, 2005. The employer's account is not presently chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant since it is not a base period employer on the claim.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

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).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

While the employer may have been justified in discharging the claimant, work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has not been established. No willful or substantial misconduct has been proven in this case.

The employer's account is not presently chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant since it is not a base period employer on the claim. If the employer becomes a base period employer in a future benefit year, its account may be chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant based on this separation from employment.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated November 7, 2005, reference 04, is reversed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

saw/kjw