

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**TATIANA B KAMANGO
345 17TH ST SE
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52403 2241**

**TYSON FRESH MEATS INC
% TALX UCM SERVICES INC
PO BOX 283
SAINT LOUIS MO 63166**

APPEAL 21A-UI-25542-AW-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

APPEAL RIGHTS:

This Decision Shall Become Final Unless, within fifteen (15) days from the mailing date below the administrative law judge's signature on the last page of the decision, 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:

***Employment Appeal Board
4th Floor – Lucas Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Fax: (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov***

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.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

The name, address and social security number of the claimant.

A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.

That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.

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.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

ONLINE RESOURCES:

UI law and administrative rules:

<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-law-and-administrative-rules>

UI Benefits Handbook:

<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-claimant-handbook>

Employer UI Handbook: <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/employer-handbook>

Report UI fraud: <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/report-fraud>

Employer account access and information: <https://www.myiowaui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/>

National Career Readiness Certificate and Skilled Iowa Initiative: <http://skillediowa.org/>

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TATIANA B KAMANGO
Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-25542-AW-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC
Employer

**OC: 09/12/21
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the November 8, 2021 (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits finding claimant was discharged on September 12, 2021 and employer had not established disqualifying job-related misconduct. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 18, 2022. Claimant participated. French interpretation was provided by Temina (ID 11891) and Aurelie (ID 13387) of CTS Language Link. Employer participated through Lori Direnzo, Human Resources Administrator. No exhibits were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct.
Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.
Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

Claimant was employed as a full-time Production Worker from June 11, 2018 until her employment with Tyson Fresh Meats ended on September 15, 2021. Claimant worked Monday through Saturday from 6:00 a.m. until 2:45 p.m. Claimant's direct supervisor varied.

Employer has a points-based attendance policy. The policy is outlined in the employee handbook. Claimant received a copy of the handbook. On September 15, 2021, claimant's supervisor, Pum Pian, gave claimant a letter stating that her employment was terminated due to attendance. Pian also took claimant's work identification badge. Claimant did not know that her employment was in jeopardy. Claimant had not received the requisite number of points for termination of employment. Claimant asked employer's human resources department to allow her to keep her job after receiving the termination letter. Claimant did not voluntarily quit or abandon her job.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason.

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 disqualification shall continue 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:

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 of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) provides:

(7) *Excessive unexcused absenteeism*. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct*. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying

termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge, as the trier of fact, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other evidence you believe; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The findings of fact show how I have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. I assessed the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, considering the applicable factors listed above, and using my own common sense and experience. I find the claimant's testimony to be more credible than employer's testimony. Employer's testimony is not consistent with the information provided in its protest.

There is no evidence that claimant was discharged for excessive unexcused absenteeism. Employer has not met its burden of proving disqualifying job-related misconduct. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Because claimant's separation is not disqualifying, the issues of overpayment, repayment and charges are moot.

DECISION:

The November 8, 2021 (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment and charges are moot.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

February 7, 2022

Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/acw