IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

FAID A SALAH Claimant

APPEAL NO. 17A-UI-08745-S1-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

AGRI STAR MEAT & POULTRY LLC Employer

OC: 07/23/17 Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Agri Star Meat & Poultry (employer) appealed a representative's August 15, 2017, decision (reference 01) that concluded Faid Salah (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for September 14, 2017. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated by Laura Roney, Payroll/Human Resources Assistant, and Jason Manning, Poultry Supervisor. 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 July 16, 2013, and at the end of his employment he was working as a full-time foreman. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on July 16, 2013. The employer is unaware of previous warnings issued to the claimant.

On July 24, 2017, the claimant and a subordinate were having a verbal altercation when the subordinate would not follow instructions. The subordinate called the claimant a "motherfucker" and the claimant pushed the subordinate to the floor. Both employees were placed on suspension pending investigation. On July 26, 2017, the claimant was terminated. The subordinate was issued a reprimand.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of July 23, 2017. He did not receive any unemployment insurance benefits after his separation from employment. The employer participated personally at the fact finding interview on August 7, 2017, by Laura Roney.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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:

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. lowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). The claimant clearly disregarded the standards of behavior which an employer has a right to expect of its employees. The claimant's actions were volitional. He intentionally pushed an employee to the ground. When a claimant intentionally disregards the standards of behavior that the employer has a right to expect of its employees, the claimant's actions are misconduct. The claimant was discharged for misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's August 15, 2017, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid

wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/rvs