

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

**STEVEN L HUMPHREY**

Claimant

**JEWELL MACHINE & FABRICATION**

Employer

**APPEAL NO. 19A-UI-06302-B2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 06/30/19**

**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated August 1, 2019, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on September 3, 2019. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Adam Berntgen and Chad Peppers. Employer's Exhibits 1-5 were admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on July 2, 2019. Employer discharged claimant on July 2, 2019 because claimant failed to follow instructions resulting in product wastage after multiple warnings.

Claimant worked as a machine operator for employer for a bit over three months. During that time claimant received three warnings for substandard work, carelessness, and failure to follow instructions for producing poor quality products. During the warnings, claimant had been given the opportunity to ask for additional training to help him produce products that would be within specifications. Claimant refused additional training.

Claimant's work was periodically checked by supervisors to see whether his work product was within specifications. On July 1, 2019 a supervisor checked claimant's early work product to find it at the high end within specification. Supervisor alerted claimant that he needed to keep an eye on this. When claimant's work was examined later in the day, it was discovered that his products were, to a large extent, out of spec. Employer then took the time to individually measure the products to determine which were appropriate for sale. A great percentage (360 out of 440) of total products made were found to be out of spec and junked. Claimant was terminated for repeatedly having substandard work after warnings.

Claimant stated that he never intended to have the items outside of spec. Employer stated that claimant had at his disposal the ability to check his product while it was being produced to ensure that it was within spec.

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982), Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

In order to establish misconduct as to disqualify a former employee from benefits an employer must establish the employee was responsible for a deliberate act or omission which was a material breach of the duties and obligations owed by the employee to the employer. Rule 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 275 N.W.2d 445 (Iowa 1979); *Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). The

conduct must show a 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 the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Rule 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; *Huntoon* supra; *Henry* supra.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning production of product within specifications. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant's repeated errors after warnings and after refusal of additional training amounts to carelessness and negligence shown on such a repeated basis to equate to intentional actions. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated August 1, 2019, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Blair A. Bennett  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn