

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ANKA DRAZIC**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-06819-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**TYSON FRESH MEATS INC**  
Employer

**OC: 04/28/13**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Tyson Fresh Meats (employer) appealed a representative's May 28, 2013 decision (reference 02) that concluded Anka Drazic (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 12, 2013. The claimant participated personally through Tanja Abramovic, Interpreter. The employer participated by Kristi Fox, Human Resources Clerk.

**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 considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on August 15, 2000, as a full-time production worker. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's policies on May 20, 2006. The policies were written in Croatian. The employer did not issue the claimant any warnings during her employment.

On April 16 and 17, 2013, a supervisor was watching the claimant work on the line. The claimant thought she was setting her up for discharge. On April 17, 2013, the claimant was crying and frustrated. She said if she were young, she would have hit her. The employer suspended the claimant on April 18, 2013. On April 29, 2013, the employer terminated the claimant.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not 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.

Repeated unintentionally careless behavior of claimant towards subordinates and others, after repeated warnings, is misconduct. Greene v. Employment Appeal Board, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. 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 Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). The employer did not provide sufficient evidence of job-related misconduct. The claimant was upset and crying. She made a careless mistake. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The representative's May 28, 2013 decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css