# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

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

**WALTER J DADE** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 18A-UI-08095-JE-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

**DECISION** 

**US POSTAL SERVICE** 

Employer

OC: 07/01/18

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the July 20, 2018, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on August 20, 2018. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

## **ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time city courier assistant for US Postal Service from February 24, 2018 to March 24, 2018. He was discharged after being involved in a minor accident.

The claimant reported for his 9:00 a.m. shift March 24, 2018, and after the other drivers received their vehicles, the claimant received a van to make his mail delivery. There was a snow storm that day and drivers are not allowed to warm up their vehicles. Consequently, the back windows of the van were not well defrosted when the claimant arrived at his first stop which was a restaurant/bar. He backed in to deliver a package and bumped a wooden beam. There was no damage done to the van but the beam was slightly cracked. The claimant followed the employer's procedure and called his supervisor. The union was also notified and his supervisor and the union representative met the claimant at the site of the incident. They told him not to be upset and the employer talked to the restaurant/bar owner and they exchanged information. The claimant went back to the post office and was told to watch retraining videos. He was told his employment was not going to be terminated. He watched the videos for two hours before the postmaster of that branch arrived and told the claimant he had the choice of resigning or being discharged. He was told if he resigned he could be rehired in 90 days. Consequently, the claimant chose to resign.

### **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.

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(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. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proving disqualifying misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. 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 Board*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

The claimant was told if he did not resign his employment would be terminated, which is the equivalent of a discharge. When misconduct is alleged as the reason for the discharge and subsequent disqualification of benefits, it is incumbent upon the employer to present evidence in support of its allegations. Allegations of misconduct without additional evidence shall not be

sufficient to result in disqualification. 871 IAC 24.32(4). The employer did not participate in the hearing and failed to provide any evidence. The evidence provided by the claimant does not rise to the level of disqualifying job misconduct, as that term is defined by Iowa law. The employer has not met its burden of proof. Therefore, benefits are allowed.

## **DECISION:**

| The July 20,   | 2018,  | reference 02, | decision | is reverse | ed. | The clain | nant was | disch | arged fr | om |
|----------------|--------|---------------|----------|------------|-----|-----------|----------|-------|----------|----|
| employment     | for no | disqualifying | reason.  | Benefits   | are | allowed,  | provided | the   | claimant | is |
| otherwise elig | gible. |               |          |            |     |           |          |       |          |    |

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/scn