

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**JAMES THOMPSON**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-12058-W**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**TARGET CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 09/2/12**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a fact-finding decision dated September 27, 2012, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, an in-person hearing was scheduled for and held on January 25, 2013. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Lyndsay Cota, H.R. Business Partner and Jeremy Thomas, Senior Group Leader. Employer Exhibit A was admitted into evidence on the date of hearing. Employer Exhibit B is a video (disc) which was watched at the hearing and then mailed by the employer following the hearing. It is in the record.

**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 was employed as a full-time utility attendant. He was hired in September 2004. He was discharged on September 1, 2012 by employer for aggressive verbal and physical conduct toward a team member.

On August 28, 2012, claimant was involved in an incident with another employee. The employee reported the matter to the H.R. team. The matter was investigated and video footage was reviewed. The employer determined that the video evidence demonstrated that claimant had engaged in misconduct.

**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.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct.

The video evidence in Exhibit B shows that the claimant was approached by a co-worker who appears to start a dispute with the claimant. It shows the claimant move away from the co-worker to talk to another employee. It then shows the co-worker follow the claimant in an apparent effort to carry on the dispute. The dispute appears to get heated at one point and there may have been some contact between the claimant and the co-worker. The video does not depict any misconduct.

**DECISION:**

The fact-finding decision dated September 27, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

Joseph L. Walsh  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlw/tll