

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ERIN J EVANS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-08761-S1-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CENTRAL IOWA HOSPITAL  
CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 07/10/16**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Erin Evans (claimant) appealed a representative's August 3, 2016, decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits after her separation from employment with Central Iowa Hospital Corporation (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for September 1, 2016. The claimant was represented by Katrina Phillips, Attorney at Law, and participated personally. The employer participated by Barbara Owca. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**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 on May 19, 2014, as a full-time registered nurse. The employer has policies that are online. It encourages employees to read the policies. The employer did not issue the claimant any warnings during her employment.

On July 1, 2016, the claimant entered a patient's room and administered a pain medication, Toradol. The claimant had cared for the patient for a week without incident. The patient immediately asked for morphine. The claimant asked the patient if she might wait twenty to thirty minutes to see if the Toradol was going to work for her. The patient became upset and raised her voice. The claimant raised her voice to speak over the patient. The claimant was trying to tell the patient she would go and get the morphine. Another registered nurse walked in while the two were speaking in raised voices. The patient complained about the claimant and the other registered nurse took over the care of the patient. The claimant did not work after July 1, 2016. On July 15, 2016, the employer terminated the claimant for her actions on July 1, 2016.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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).

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). If a party has the power to produce more explicit and direct evidence than it chooses to do, it may be fairly inferred that other evidence would lay open deficiencies in that party's case. Crosser v. Iowa Department of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976). The employer had the power to present testimony but chose not to do so. The employer did not provide first-hand testimony at the hearing and, therefore, did not provide sufficient eye witness evidence of job-related misconduct to rebut the claimant's denial of said conduct. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The representative's August 3, 2016, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer has not met its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs