

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JUSTIN D HOLM
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-11615-SWT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SCC CLEANING INC
Employer

OC: 07/05/09
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated August 5, 2009, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on August 27, 2009. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. No one participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as a janitor at the Crossroads Mall from December 24, 2008, to July9, 2009. His supervisor, John Moran, discharged the claimant because he was alleged to have engaged in horseplay, work was not being done, and Moran had to make the mall happy.

The claimant performed his job to the best of his ability and never deliberately violated any work rules or instructions. He did not deliberately disregard the employer's interests or the standards of behavior required for employees.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

The unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. The rules define misconduct as (1) deliberate acts or omissions by a worker that materially breach the duties and obligations arising out of the contract of employment, (2) deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of employees, or (3) carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design. 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 misconduct within the meaning of the statute. 871 IAC 24.32(1).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. 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).

No work-connected misconduct has been proven in this case.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 5, 2009, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

Steven A. Wise
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

saw/css