

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

EDGAR I GARCIA
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 06A-UI-10661-SWT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MERCY HOSPITAL
Employer

**OC: 10/01/06 R: 02
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated October 25, 2006, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on November 15, 2006. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing with witnesses, Nikolina Radocaj and Angela Kirwa. Ron Robertson participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with a witness, Kevin Elsberry.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full-time for the employer as a scope technician from February 14, 2006, to October 4, 2006. The claimant was informed and understood that under the employer's work rules, conduct of a sexual nature in the workplace was grounds for disciplinary action. The claimant was counseled by his supervisor on July 18, 2006, about making inappropriate comments to coworkers.

Sometime in September 2006, employees made false complaints to management that the claimant and a female employee had inappropriately touched each other in the workplace in front of other employees, specifically that they had massaged each other and had exchanged comments of a sexual nature. The claimant did not engage in the conduct alleged.

On October 4, 2006, the employer discharged the claimant for engaging in inappropriate conduct of a sexual nature in the workplace.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

The findings of fact show how I resolved the disputed factual issues in this case by carefully assessing of the credibility of the witnesses and reliability of the evidence and by applying the proper standard and burden of proof. The employer's evidence consisted of hearsay from unidentified individuals. The employer's witnesses could not say when the alleged misconduct took place. A judge in an unemployment insurance hearing is not reviewing whether the employer conducted a thorough investigation but is actually deciding whether the alleged misconduct occurred. The claimant testified very credibly that the allegations were false and his testimony was supported by witnesses with firsthand knowledge of the facts. The claimant's

testimony is believable and entitled to greater weight than the employer's evidence. No misconduct has been proven in this case.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated October 25, 2006, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

Steven A. Wise
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

saw/cs