

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

PATRICIA L SARAZIN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-04018-MT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF NE IA INC
Employer

OC: 03/17/13
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated April 1, 2013, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on May 10, 2013. Claimant participated personally with witness Jamie Mackedanz. Employer participated by Tom Kuiper, Hearing Representative, TALX with witnesses Sharon Samec, Vice President Human Resources; Steve Tisue, Vice President Human Resources; Jim Dix, Associate Program Manager; and Margee Woywood, Program Manager. Exhibits A, One and Two 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 March 18, 2013.

Employer discharged claimant on March 18, 2013 because claimant allegedly lost her driver's license. Employer required claimant to have a valid driver's license to perform work for employer. Employer told claimant that she would face discharge for loss of a license. Claimant was charged with driving under the influence of alcohol. Claimant entered into a prolonged appeal process over her suspension. Claimant beat the OWI charge. Claimant continued appealing the license suspension. Claimant did have a valid license at the time of separation. Claimant informed employer that her license was still valid and she was going to appeal. Employer discharged claimant with knowledge that claimant had a valid license.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

871 IAC 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.

871 IAC 24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the 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.

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 fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning maintaining a valid driver's license. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct because claimant had a valid license at the time of separation. Employer jumped the gun on the separation as the license was still valid. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated April 1, 2013, reference 01, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/css