

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

STEFFEN D PRICE

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 07A-UI-06274-LT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ACCESS DIRECT TELEMARKETING INC

Employer

**OC: 05/20/07 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the June 14, 2007, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on July 10, 2007. Claimant participated and called as a witness Joshua Wetherell who hung up prior to the conclusion of the opening statement and did not participate. Employer participated through David Coveney and Ashley Eichelberger and was represented by Elizabeth Svehlek of Johnson & Associates.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a part-time sales consultant from February 13, 2006 until May 21, 2007 when he was discharged. During a counseling session on May 15 claimant described shift manager Brian Luce as a “fucking douche.” He was sent home for the day pending investigation. Ashley Eichelberger witnessed the comment. On May 13, 2006 claimant defaced a toy with swastikas and he was issued a final written warning.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

"The use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct, even in the case of isolated incidents or situations in which the target of abusive name-calling is not present when the vulgar statements are initially made." *Myers v. EAB*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa App. 1990).

DECISION:

The June 14, 2007, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs