

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**MERIH L GHEBREMICHAEL**  
Claimant

**WELLS ENTERPRISES INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 18A-UI-06505-SC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 11/26/17  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Merih L. Ghebremichael (claimant) filed an appeal from the June 8, 2018, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon the determination Wells Enterprises, Inc. (employer) discharged him for using profane language on the job. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 29, 2018. The claimant participated. The employer did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. No exhibits were offered into the record.

**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: The claimant was employed full-time as a Machine Operator beginning on February 27, 2017, and was separated from employment on May 18, 2018, when he was discharged. The claimant was involved in a verbal argument with another employee. The other employee used profanity towards the claimant and the claimant responded with profanity. When the other employee started becoming physically aggressive, the claimant contacted a supervisor as he did not want to lose his job over a physical altercation at work. He reported to the supervisor what had happened. The claimant was discharged for using profanity on the job.

The employer has a policy requiring civility in the workplace. However, profanity is regularly used by employees at work. The claimant once reported that he had been called an offensive racial name by another co-worker and Human Resources did not do anything. The claimant had not received any prior warnings. The claimant did not know his job was in jeopardy for using profanity at work.

**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. Benefits are allowed.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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 provides, in relevant part:

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.

...

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

The definition of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential

liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

Generally, profanity or offensive language can be disqualifying in an isolated incident. *Myers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). In this case, the claimant's unrefuted testimony is that employees regularly used profanity in a disrespectful or confrontational manner and the employer accepted that behavior. The claimant did not know his job could be in jeopardy for use of profanity as other employees had engaged in the same conduct without repercussions and he had not received a 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. The employer has not met the burden of proof to establish that the claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. Benefits are allowed.

#### **DECISION:**

The June 8, 2018, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The 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.

---

Stephanie R. Callahan  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn