

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LUCINDA L DALTON

Claimant

HEARTLAND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

Employer

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-15423-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 12/21/08

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

Section 96.4-3 – Able and Available

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Lucinda Dalton (claimant) appealed a representative's October 5, 2009 decision (reference 06) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits based upon her separation from work with Heartland Employment Services (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for November 16, 2009. 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.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason and whether she able and available for work.

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 May 20, 2009, as a full-time registered nurse. The employer suspended the claimant on July 15, 2009, due to an investigation regarding a previous employer. The claimant continues to look for work. She is able and available for work.

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. Casper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). An employer may discharge or suspend an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about any of the issues leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or negligently in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning.

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.

The administrative law judge concludes the claimant is able and available for work.

Iowa Code section 96.4-3 provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph 1, or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept

suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

When an employee is ill and not able and available for work, she is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant is considered to be able and available for work. The claimant is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's October 5, 2009 decision (reference 06) is reversed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job-related misconduct. The claimant is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are allowed.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css