

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

VERNON L WILLIAMS
423 S 15TH ST
MOUNT VERNON IL 62864-4820

BARR-NUNN TRANSPORTATION INC
ATTN-KATHY
1803 BURROAK BLVD
PO BOX 518
GRANGER IA 50109

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-06504-SWT
OC: 05/28/06 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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated June 19, 2006, reference 01, that concluded he was discharged for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on July 13, 2006. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. Amy Hanson participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as an over-the-road truck driver from October 14, 2003, to May 22, 2006. The claimant was informed and understood that under the employer's work rules, drivers were prohibited from leaving a loaded trailer at an unapproved unsecured site. The employer had a list of approved sites, which did not include any truck

stops. In March 2006, the employer had issued a warning to all drivers about not dropping a trailer at an unsecured site after a trailer was stolen from a truck stop.

On May 20, 2005, the claimant had a loaded trailer and was home for the weekend. He uncoupled the trailer from the tractor and left it at a truck stop in his home town. He drove the tractor home. He knew it was a violation of the rules but did not think that it would be a problem because the area where he dropped the trailer had a fence around part of it and he put a lock on gladhand connector and king pin.

A driver noticed the uncoupled trailer at the truck stop and reported it to management. The employer discharged the claimant on May 22, 2006, for violating the rule prohibiting drivers from leaving a loaded trailer at an unapproved unsecured site.

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 claimant's violation of a known work rule was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated June 19, 2006, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits until he has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

saw/pjs