

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

BRUCE E WANNEMAKER  
4756 N 13<sup>TH</sup> ST  
OMAHA NE 68110 1426

JENNIE EDMUNDSON MEMORIAL HOSP  
ATTN HUMAN RESOURCES DEPT  
933 E PIERCE ST  
COUNCIL BLUFFS IA 51503

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-00433-H2T  
OC: 12-12-04 R: 01  
Claimant: Appellant (1)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the January 6, 2005, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on January 27, 2005. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Kathy Heuwinkel, Benefits Specialist.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a general service technician in the engineering department full time beginning July 30, 2001 through December 2, 2004 when he was discharged. On December 2, 2004, a nursing student complained that the claimant was driving around a corner in a pickup truck at a high rate of speed and almost hit her and some other nursing students she was

walking with. The claimant swore at the girls using profanity while yelling at them “that’s what the fucking sidewalk is for.” The claimant got out of his truck, left it in the road, came into the hospital, went to his supervisor, gave him keys and went home. The claimant had previously been disciplined for harassing another lab employee of the hospital when he drove his truck toward her at a high rate of speed.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

“The use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct, even in the case of isolated incidents or situations in which the target of abusive name-calling is not present when the vulgar statements are initially made.” Myers v. EAB, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa App. 1990).

An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's rights by using profanity when speaking to nursing students at the hospital. The claimant had previously been warned about his unacceptable and in appropriate treatment of coworkers and others at the hospital. His actions on December 2, 2004 constitute sufficient misconduct to disqualify him from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant's disregard of the employer's rights and interests is misconduct. As such, the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are denied.

**DECISION:**

The January 6, 2005, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

tkh/sc