

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

COMFORT S GEE
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-11111-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION**
Employer

**OC: 09/01/13
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Comfort Gee (claimant) appealed a representative's September 24, 2013, decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Cargill Meat Solutions Corporation (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for October 23, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer did not provide a telephone number where it could be reached and therefore, did not participate in the hearing. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on January 28, 2013, as a full-time cut floor worker. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook. The claimant was expecting a baby and due on September 6, 2013. At work she was to change into clothing before she started work. Due to her pregnancy, she had problems putting on the clothes. She was never late arriving at work but she was late arriving at her workstation because she had trouble dressing in her work clothes. The employer issued her a warning for this. She was allowed three bathroom breaks a day. On July 31, 2013, the claimant requested her third bathroom break and the request was granted. Her supervisor accompanied the claimant to the bathroom. The claimant was absent from work a few minutes. The supervisor did not complain. On August 1, 2013, the employer terminated the claimant for wasting company time.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for misconduct.

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 individual shall be disqualified for benefits 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.

871 IAC 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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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 Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). The employer did not participate in the hearing and, therefore, provided no evidence of job-related misconduct. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The representative's September 24, 2013, decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css