

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

MARIAH R SCHMELZER
Claimant

A Y MC DONALD MFG CO
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-00936-JC-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 09/20/20
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant, Mariah R. Schmelzer, filed an appeal from the November 25, 2020 (reference 01) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on February 12, 2021. The claimant participated personally. The employer, A Y MC Donald Manufacturing Co., participated through Michelle McDonald.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Did claimant voluntarily quit the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a benefits specialist and was separated from employment on September 10, 2020, when she was given the option to resign in lieu of termination. Continuing work was not available.

Employer intended to discharge claimant based upon her performance and ongoing disagreements with Ms. McDonald. Claimant worked to the best of her ability. Claimant had no prior documented discipline and had not been informed her job was in jeopardy. Employer stated there was no final incident which led to the decision to discharge. Employer also asserted it was not contesting benefits.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue before the administrative law judge is whether the employer's agreement not to contest a claim for unemployment insurance benefits ensures that the claimant will receive unemployment benefits. It does not. The decision about whether a claimant receives or is denied unemployment insurance benefits is not up to the employer or the claimant, but is determined by Iowa Workforce Development applying the facts of the claimant's job separation to the Unemployment Security Law as enacted by the state legislature. Whereupon the employer might agree not to contest a claim, that promise, in and of itself, does not guarantee that a claimant will receive unemployment insurance benefits, but only that the employer will not hinder any efforts on the part of the claimant to make a claim for unemployment benefits.

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant quit in lieu of discharge, and disqualifying, job-related misconduct has not been established.

Iowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants who voluntarily quit employment without good cause attributable to the employer or who are discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §§ 96.5(1) and 96.5(2)a. They remain disqualified until such time as they requalify for benefits by working and earning insured wages ten times their weekly benefit amount. *Id.*

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(21) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(21) The claimant was compelled to resign when given the choice of resigning or being discharged. This shall not be considered a voluntary leaving.

A voluntary quitting of employment requires that an employee exercise a voluntary choice between remaining employed or terminating the employment relationship. *Wills v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 447 N.W.2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989); *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438, 440 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992). A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). In this case, the claimant did not have the option of remaining employed nor did she express intent to terminate the employment relationship. Where there is no expressed intention or act to sever the relationship, the case must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

In analyzing quits in lieu of discharge, the administrative law judge considers whether the evidence establishes misconduct that would disqualify the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.32(1)a provides:

"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).

In an at-will employment environment, an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. 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). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). 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).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The purpose of this rule is to assure that an employer does not save up acts of misconduct and spring them on an employee when an independent desire to terminate arises. In this case, claimant had no prior documented discipline and was unaware her job was in jeopardy. Employer presented no evidence of a final incident which led to the decision to discharge. Based upon the evidence presented, the employer presented insufficient evidence to corroborate its allegation that the claimant was discharged for misconduct. Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has failed to meet its burden of proof in establishing a current act of disqualifying job-related misconduct. As such, benefits are allowed.

Nothing in this decision should be interpreted as a condemnation of the employer's right to terminate the claimant for violating its policies and procedures. The employer had a right to follow its policies and procedures. The analysis of unemployment insurance eligibility, however, does not end there. This ruling simply holds that the employer did not meet its burden of proof to establish the claimant's conduct leading separation was misconduct under Iowa law.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated November 25, 2020, (reference 01) is REVERSED. The claimant did not quit the employment. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible.



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

February 23, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn

NOTE TO CLAIMANT:

You may find information about food, housing, and other resources at <https://covidrecoveryiowa.org/> or at <https://dhs.iowa.gov/node/3250>

Iowa Finance Authority also has additional resources at <https://www.iowafinance.com/about/covid-19-ifa-recovery-assistance/>