

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

KEITH V DAVIS
Claimant

PACKERS SANITATION SERVICES INC
Employer

APPEAL 19A-UI-10086-AW-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION

OC: 08/04/19
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the December 17, 2019 (reference 05) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 15, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. Claimant participated. Employer participated through James Thompson Coleman, Site Manager. Employer's Exhibits 1 – 3 were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Whether claimant's separation was a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to employer or a discharge due to disqualifying job-related misconduct.
Whether claimant was overpaid benefits.
Whether claimant should repay those benefits and/or whether employer should be charged based upon its participation in the fact-finding interview.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time sanitation technician from October 18, 2019 until his employment with Packers Sanitation Services, Inc. ended on November 24, 2019. Claimant received a warning regarding his job performance and was told that he may be terminated if his performance did not improve. On November 23, 2019, claimant told a supervisor that he may quit because he did not want to be terminated over his job performance. Claimant did not say that he quit. Claimant never intended to quit his job. Claimant reported to work on November 24, 2019 and was told that he was discharged for poor job performance. Claimant never performed his job to employer's satisfaction. Claimant did not intentionally perform his job duties poorly.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did not voluntarily quit his employment; claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Iowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). Where there is no expressed intention or act to sever the employment relationship, the case must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). In this case, claimant had no intention of terminating his employment relationship with Packers Sanitation Services, Inc. Because claimant did not voluntarily quit his job, claimant's separation from employment must be analyzed as a discharge.

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 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(1)(a) provides:

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 of misconduct 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). Further, 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).

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. 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." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). 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 Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). A failure in job performance is not misconduct unless it is intentional. *Huntoon*, supra; *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

Employer discharged claimant for poor job performance. There is no evidence that claimant's failure in job performance was intentional; therefore, it does not constitute misconduct. Employer has not met its burden of proving disqualifying job-related misconduct. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. Because claimant's separation was not disqualifying, the issues of overpayment, repayment and chargeability are moot.

DECISION:

The December 17, 2019 (reference 05) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment and chargeability are moot.

Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/scn