

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TANSHA D GORDON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-03905-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**RAFIKI HOTELS
HOWARD JOHNSON**
Employer

OC: 03/10/13
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Tansha Gordon (claimant) appealed a representative's March 28, 2013 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Howard Johnson (employer) for failure to follow instructions in the performance of her work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for May 7, 2013. The claimant participated personally and through Ashley Wilson and Cindy Jones, Former Coworkers. The employer participated by Danielle Huddleston, Assistant Manager.

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 March 23, 2012, as a part-time housekeeper. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on February 3, 2013, but the claimant does not remember receiving the handbook. The claimant never received the two written warnings that the employer prepared regarding changing linens dated June 17 and December 6, 2012. The claimant always changed the linens. She was particular about cleanliness. On March 9, 2013, the employer terminated the claimant. It told the claimant she was terminated for failure to change linens but she had changed the linens.

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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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 any evidence of job-related misconduct. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

The claimant's and the employer's testimony is inconsistent. The administrative law judge finds the claimant's testimony to be more credible because she was an eye witnesses to the events for which she was terminated. The employer provided no eye witnesses.

DECISION:

The representative's March 28, 2013 decision (reference 01) is reversed. 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