

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**RYAN P PHILLIPS**  
Claimant

**WEST LIBERTY FOODS LLC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 17A-UI-07211-DL-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 06/18/17**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

---

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed an appeal from the July 14, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 11, 2017. Claimant participated. Employer participated through human resource supervisor Monica Dyar. Employer's Exhibit 1 (pp 1-26) were received.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time waste-water mechanic from 2009, through June 23, 2017. His last day of work was June 21, 2017, when he was suspended. On Sunday, June 4, 2017, he was on rounds authorized by supervisor Nolan Lestage<sup>1</sup>, with co-worker facilities mechanic Rick Gonzales because Gonzales was going to retire soon and claimant was learning his job duties. They went to the mezzanine and he followed Gonzales into a computer room with a secured entrance that Gonzales said he regularly checked as a part of his rounds. While Gonzales opened the door, claimant looked at his phone. Claimant was unaware that Gonzales did not have authority to enter the room. They entered the room at 3:53 p.m. Gonzales showed claimant the room and explained how things work. Then they talked about work related issues before turning to a discussion about personal matters and lost track of time. They left the room at 4:46 p.m. The time they spent on non-work matters was not authorized break time.

The employer became aware of unrelated damage to the room so on June 20, 2017, reviewed motion sensor security camera footage, including that from June 4. When confronted, claimant admitted the unauthorized break time but denied he knew how Gonzales gained access or that he was not allowed in the room. Claimant believed, but did not verify, that Gonzales had logged him in on his tablet since the only waste-water tablet was in use in another area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lestage did not participate in the hearing.

The employer accused him of being dishonest about not knowing how Gonzales entered the room, unauthorized break time, not logging time on the work order. Both claimant and Gonzales were discharged. The employer had not previously warned claimant his job was in jeopardy for any similar reasons. Facility maintenance worker Ross Miser entered the computer room with something in his hand while claimant and Gonzales were there. He received a one-day suspension and kept his job. Others found sleeping on the mezzanine in the past had kept their jobs after a suspension.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

When the record is composed solely of hearsay evidence, that evidence must be examined closely in light of the entire record. *Schmitz v. Iowa Dep't Human Servs.*, 461 N.W.2d 603, 607 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Both the quality and the quantity of the evidence must be evaluated to see whether it rises to the necessary levels of trustworthiness, credibility, and accuracy required by a reasonably prudent person in the conduct of serious affairs. See, Iowa Code § 17A.14(1). In making the evaluation, the fact-finder should conduct a common sense evaluation of (1) the nature of the hearsay; (2) the availability of better evidence; (3) the cost of acquiring better information; (4) the need for precision; and (5) the administrative policy to be fulfilled. *Schmitz*, 461 N.W.2d at 608.

The decision in this case rests, at least in part, upon the credibility of the parties. The employer did not present a witness with direct knowledge of the situation. Noting that the claimant presented direct, first-hand testimony while the employer relied upon second-hand reports, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant's recollection of the events is more credible than that of the employer.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

##### **Causes for disqualification.**

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.

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. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); accord *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

Misconduct "must be substantial" to justify the denial of unemployment benefits. *Lee*, 616 N.W.2d at 665 (citation omitted). "Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." *Id.* (citation omitted). ...the definition of misconduct requires more than a "disregard" it requires a "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." Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)(a) (emphasis added).

Whether an employee violated an employer's policies is a different issue from whether the employee is disqualified for misconduct for purposes of unemployment insurance benefits. See *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000) ("Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." (Quoting *Reigelsberger*, 500 N.W.2d at 66.)).

The conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment in relying on Gonzales' representations and losing track of time. Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about the issue leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. Training or general notice to staff about a policy is not considered a disciplinary warning. The employer's simple accrual of a certain number of rule violations counting towards discharge does not establish repeated negligence or deliberation and is not dispositive of the issue of misconduct for the purpose of determining eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits. Further, it is at least arguable that since the consequence to claimant was more severe than other employees received for similar conduct, the disparate application of the policy cannot support a disqualification from benefits.

**DECISION:**

The July 14, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/scn