

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DANIEL V VARGAS
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-03687-LT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SWIFT & COMPANY
Employer

OC: 02/07/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the March 8, 2010 (reference 01) decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on April 21, 2010. Claimant participated through Interpreter Celia Huante. Employer participated through Human Resources Manager Cheryl Hughlette. Tony Luse did not participate.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant most recently worked full time as a production worker and was separated from employment on January 21, 2010. On January 13 he loaded a trailer that had a hold tag on it from quality assurance. It was shipped to a customer with a tag on it and the customer shipped it back with a complaint on January 21, 2010. Employer had warned him on January 13, 2010 about not checking two different loads to make sure they were wrapped correctly. On October 13, 2009 employer warned him about safety after he failed to put chock blocks under the trailer wheels to prevent shifting or moving. On June 3, 2009 employer warned him for not placing trailer blocks under the front of the trailer to keep it from falling. Employer asked claimant for an explanation with the union representative present. The grievance was withdrawn.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related 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.

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.

Claimant did not rebut employer's reason for the separation and his repeated failure to safely and accurately perform his job duties after having been warned is evidence of carelessness to such a degree of recurrence as to rise to the level of disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The March 8, 2010 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css