

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**CORY WILLIAMS**

Claimant

**1<sup>ST</sup> CLASS SECURITY INC**

Employer

**APPEAL 18R-UI-11037-DG-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 08/19/18**

**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 September 10, 2018, (reference 02) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on November 28, 2018. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by James Carlson, President. Employer's Exhibits 1-4 were admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related 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 August 16, 2018. Employer discharged claimant on August 16, 2018, because his security guard identification card was revoked by the state of Iowa.

Claimant began working for employer on June 30, 2017. Claimant was notified that he had to have a valid security license to maintain his employment with this employer. Employer made an error and did not get claimant's application for a security guard identification card approved until April 24, 2018. Employer received a notice from the state of Iowa on August 16, 2018 which informed employer that it was unlawful for employer to allow claimant to continue working as a loss prevention officer because his security guard identification card was revoked on or about August 13, 2018.

The state of Iowa does not tell employers why a license is revoked, and employer and claimant do not why the license was revoked. Claimant believes it is because there is a fictitious social security number that the state got a hit on, but neither party has any evidence of why the State of Iowa made its decision. The Employer notified claimant that his employment was terminated effective immediately on August 16, 2018.

## 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.

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).

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.

Repeated traffic violations rendering a claimant uninsurable can constitute job misconduct even if the traffic citations were received on the claimant's own time and in his own vehicle. *Cook v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 299 N.W.2d 698 (Iowa 1980).

The employer is not obligated to employ the claimant after his security guard identification card was revoked. Employer does have a legal obligation to abide by security rules and regulations promulgated by the Iowa legislature and not allow unlicensed individuals to work as security guards or loss prevention officers. Claimant's failure to maintain his security guard identification card as a known condition of employment was misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits. Benefits are denied.

**DECISION:**

The September 10, 2018, (reference 02) unemployment insurance 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.

---

Duane L. Golden  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/scn