

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

YADHIRA E TAPIA  
813 PARK ST  
PERRY IA 50220

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC  
c/o FRICK UC EXPRESS  
PO BOX 283  
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-02131-H2T  
OC: 01-09-05 R: 02  
Claimant: Respondent (1)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the February 23, 2005, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on March 16, 2005. The claimant did participate through the interpretation of Rosemary Paramo Ricoy. The employer did participate through Tom Barragan, Employment Manager.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a production worker full time beginning August 23, 2004 through November 25, 2004 when she was discharged. The claimant was discharged due to allegations of not working fast and efficiently according to the employer's expectations. She

had not received any warnings that her job was in jeopardy and performed the work to the best of her ability.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979). Where an individual is discharged due to a failure in job performance, proof of that individual's ability to do the job is required to justify disqualification, rather than accepting the employer's subjective view. To do so is to impermissibly shift the burden of proof to the claimant. Kelly v. IDJS, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa App. 1986). Inasmuch as she did attempt to perform the job to the best of her ability but was unable to meet the employer's expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Accordingly, no disqualification pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a is imposed.

#### DECISION:

The February 23, 2005, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

tkh/sc