

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**SHAWNA L SCHOTT**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 100-UI-08432-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**LIFE-LINE EMERGENCY VEHICLES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 02/14/10**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Shawna Schott (claimant) appealed a representative's March 11, 2010 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Life-Line Emergency Vehicles (employer) for insubordination in connection with her work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 29, 2010. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Melissa Mohs, Human Resources/Safety Manager, and Mike Nielsen, Supervisor.

**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 having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant worked for the employer full-time in the cabinet shop from January 24, 2007, to February 15, 2010. The employer issued the claimant a verbal warning for swearing on October 15, 2009. On November 11, 2009, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for attendance.

On February 16, 2010, the employer talked to the claimant about absenteeism issues. The claimant repeatedly yelled that it was not her "fucking fault". The employer terminated the claimant for inappropriate language.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was 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). Foul language of itself can constitute disqualifying job misconduct. Warrell v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 356 N.W.2d 587 (Iowa App. 1984). The claimant used foul language on two occasions. After the first occasion, she was warned. The claimant clearly disregarded the standards of behavior that an employer has a right to expect of its employees. The claimant's actions were volitional. When a claimant intentionally disregards the standards of behavior that the employer has a right to expect of its employees, the claimant's actions are misconduct. The claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**DECISION:**

The representative's March 11, 2010 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw