

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**MARTIN A JOHNSON**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-05574-PT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**NEIGHBORHOOD PATROL INC**  
Employer

**OC: 03/27/11  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated April 22, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on May 31, 2011. Employer participated by Rick German, Security Manager. Claimant did participate with Mark Johnson as a witness. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was employed from April 22, 2008 through March 18, 2011. He was discharged from his employment because of a complaint that he was harassing an employee at the company where he was assigned to provide security. The claimant denies the conduct complained of by the employee.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF 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.

The employer has the burden of proving misconduct. The employer's unsworn statement as to claimant's conduct is not sufficient to rebut claimant's sworn testimony. No disqualification is imposed.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated April 22, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. Benefits allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Ron Pohlman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/css