

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

WENBAI ZHANG
6430 N HARRISON ST
DAVENPORT IA 52806

HY-VEE INC
c/o TALX UCM SERVICES INC
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

TALX UC EXPRESS
3799 VILLAGE RUN DR #511
DES MOINES IA 50317

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-11399-S2T
OC: 10/16/05 R: 04
Claimant: Appellant (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:

Wenbai Zhang (claimant) appealed a representative's October 31, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Hy-Vee (employer) for insubordination in connection with his work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on November 30, 2005. The claimant participated personally, and his words were translated by Tony Chang, Interpreter. The employer was represented by David Williams, Manager of Operations, and participated by Duane Asche, Store Director; Chao Sun, Food Service Supervisor; and Chingyang Chi, Chinese Department Manager. Sarah Lloyd observed the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on February 27, 2000, as a full-time Chinese cook. The employer verbally warned the claimant repeatedly about his argumentative behavior. On March 1 and May 26, 2005, the employer issued the claimant written warnings for arguing with his supervisor. The warnings were translated for the claimant.

On October 7, 2005, the claimant started arguing with his supervisor because the claimant did not think the supervisor should take a lunch break. The supervisor warned the claimant that he should stop his behavior. The claimant continued and the supervisor reported the incident to the employer. The employer terminated the claimant on October 11, 2005.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he was.

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 of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by disregarding authority by repeatedly arguing with his supervisor after he had been warned. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, he is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's October 31, 2005 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount provided he is otherwise eligible.

bas/kjw