

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JUANITA X ZAVALA

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-10065-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS CORP

Employer

OC: 06-19-11

Claimant: Appellant (1)

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

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the July 19, 2011, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on August 23, 2011. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Sarah James, Assistant Human Resources Manager.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant file a timely appeal?

Was the claimant discharged due to job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a safety meeting facilitator full time beginning July 18, 2005, through June 21, 2011, when she was discharged. The claimant was discharged for knowingly withholding from her employer information that another employee was working under an assumed name using another person's social security number because he was an illegal alien. The claimant knew that she was to report any information she received about any employee of the employer's or any employee that was working as a contractor in the facility if she became aware that the employee was not legal to work in the United States. The claimant introduced an employee who was going by the name Manuel Martinez to her sister as "Jose." The persons' real name was Jose and he had no proper documentation to be working in the United States. The claimant's sister reported to the employer that "Manuel Martinez" was not the employee's real name and he was subsequently discharged. When the employer learned that the claimant knew the employee's real name was "Jose" but did not report to them that he was working under an assumed name, she was discharged. The claimant had been through compliance with I-9 and illegal worker training on March 10, 2009, June 17, 2010, and April 7, 2011. She knew that if she suspected an employee was working illegally, she was to report to the employer so an investigation could be conducted. The employer faces severe penalties from the federal government for failing to comply with immigration paperwork to insure that all employees and contractor employees are legally permitted to work in the United States.

The claimant did not receive the fact-finding decision until after the time to file an appeal had expired.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the claimant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The claimant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received in a timely fashion. Without timely notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The claimant filed the appeal within days of receipt. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

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.

Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). The administrative law judge is persuaded that the claimant knew that the employee who went by the name "Manuel Martinez" was not really Manuel but was in fact Jose. The claimant's argument that she introduced him as "Jose" to her sister because she introduced all men she dated as Jose because that was her late husband's name is simply not credible or believable. The claimant had a demonstrated ability in the past to properly report to her employer when she learned that an employee was possibly working illegally. Her failure in this situation to make the report is sufficient misconduct to disqualify her from receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The July 19, 2011 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/kjw