

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**MICHAEL J CORDERO**  
Claimant

**NORDSTROM INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 24A-UI-01825-AR-T**  
  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 01/21/24**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871—24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

On February 16, 2024, the employer filed an appeal from the February 7, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on the determination that claimant was discharged from employment without a showing of disqualifying misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 7, 2024. Claimant, Michael J. Cordero, participated. Employer, Nordstrom Inc., participated through Hearing Representative Carrie Merrifield, who did not testify, with testifying witnesses Unemployment Claims Specialist Megan Jenkins, Assistant Manager of Asset Protection Jessica Paulman, and Asset Protection Manager Zane Williams. No exhibits were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?  
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?  
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on October 26, 2020. Claimant last worked as a full-time asset protection agent. Claimant was separated from employment on January 17, 2024, when he was discharged.

One of the employer's expectations is that employees use good judgment in their dealings with each other and with customers. This appears in the employer's handbook, which claimant received a copy of during his employment.

The employer issued three disciplinary actions to claimant. One disciplinary action was for attendance. The other two were issued in January 2022, and September 2023, after claimant was caught sleeping on the job. All three disciplinary actions classified these incidents as lack of good judgment. They indicated that future similar conduct could result in disciplinary action up to discharge.

On January 10, 2024, Paulman sent a message to claimant stating that he might have to work the following Friday. Claimant had requested the day off to attend his daughter's basketball game. Claimant called Paulman in response to her message. Claimant asked Paulman if he would still get Friday off. Paulman said she would need to speak with Williams. Claimant seemed frustrated. He told her, "I don't care if you guys fucking fire me."

Claimant and Paulman had been friends for some time. Claimant knew that swearing at a superior was inappropriate, but the line had been blurred by their personal friendship. Furthermore, though claimant was frustrated with the news that he might have to work that Friday, he intended the comment as a joke or a flippant remark. He did not know that Paulman had taken offense.

On January 16, 2024, Williams took claimant aside and asked him if he knew why Paulman might be upset. Claimant said he did not know. Williams asked claimant if he had sworn in conversation with Paulman. Claimant admitted he had. Claimant asked what would happen in response to the incident. Williams said he did not know but it could result in discipline or discharge.

On January 17, 2024, claimant was discharged for lack of good judgment.

The administrative record indicates that claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of January 21, 2024. His weekly benefit amount is \$521.00. He has filed for and received benefit payments between January 21, 2024, and March 2, 2024. He has received a total benefit payment of \$3,126.00. The employer did not substantially participate in the fact-finding interview. Though a third-party claims representative was made available for the call, she did not provide detailed information regarding the separation.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) and (d) provide:

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 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.

...

d. For the purposes of this subsection, “*misconduct*” means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee’s contract of employment. Misconduct is 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 even 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

- (1) Material falsification of the individual’s employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer’s property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer, or a combination of such substances, on the employer’s premises in violation of the employer’s employment policies.
- (5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer’s premises in violation of the employer’s employment policies, unless the individual is compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.
- (6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.
- (7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that results in missing work.
- (8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.
- (10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.
- (11) Failure to maintain any license, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual’s regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.
- (12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.

(13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

(14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee.

The conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment. Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about the issue leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given.

The employer classified each infraction as a failure to use good judgment when issuing discipline. However, the incidents for which claimant was warned are not similar in nature to the incident for which he was ultimately discharged. Sleeping on the job and having attendance problems are not similar to cursing in conversation with a superior. The general use of "good judgment" does not give clear directives to claimant regarding what is and is not acceptable behavior.

Furthermore, the employer has not demonstrated that claimant's conduct was so egregious as to constitute misconduct without prior warning. Claimant admits to cursing in conversation with Paulman, but he did not call her names or use profanity directed at her. He was also friends with Paulman, so whether such language was inappropriate may not have been very clear to claimant when speaking with Paulman.

"The use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context, may be recognized as misconduct, even in the case of isolated incidents or situations in which the target of abusive name-calling is not present when the vulgar statements are initially made. The question of whether the use of improper language in the workplace is misconduct is nearly always a fact question. It must be considered with

other relevant factors, including the context in which it is said, and the general work environment.” *Myers v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Vulgar language in front of customers can constitute misconduct, as well as vulgarities accompanied with a refusal to obey supervisors. *Zeches v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 333 N.W.2d 735, 736 (Iowa Ct. App. 1983); *Warrell v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 356 N.W.2d 587, 589 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

The employer has not demonstrated that claimant engaged in disqualifying misconduct, as is its burden. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Because the separation is not disqualifying, the issues of overpayment, repayment, and participation are moot.

**DECISION:**

The February 7, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. Claimant was discharged from employment on January 17, 2024, for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment, and participation are moot.



---

Alexis D. Rowe  
Administrative Law Judge

---

March 8, 2024  
Decision Dated and Mailed

AR/jkb

**APPEAL RIGHTS.** If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board  
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100  
Des Moines, Iowa 50321  
Fax: (515)281-7191  
Online: [eab.iowa.gov](http://eab.iowa.gov)**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

**AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:**

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

**Note to Claimant:** It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

**SERVICE INFORMATION:**

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

**DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN.** Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board  
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100  
Des Moines, Iowa 50321  
Fax: (515)281-7191  
En línea: [eab.iowa.gov](http://eab.iowa.gov)**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

**UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:**

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiriera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

**Nota para el reclamante:** es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

**SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:**

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.