

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

GARY M BRACK
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-14737-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SCHENKER LOGISTICS INC
Employer

**Original Claim: 08/30/09
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Gary Brack (claimant) appealed a representative's September 25, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits based on his employment with Schenker Logistics (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for October 29, 2009. The claimant participated personally. The employer provided a telephone number but could not be reached at the time of the hearing. A message was left for the employer.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired in September 2006 as a full-time forklift operator. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook. The employer issued the claimant a written warning for an accident in which his forklift came in contact with an electronic vehicle. The claimant received another written warning when he was working and unaware of a pedestrian near his forklift.

The employer has a policy that states that when an employee fills his forklift with fuel, he must lock the ignition key to the fuel nozzle. When finished, the employee must remove the key, disconnect the fuel nozzle, and return to the forklift seat. The claimant signed for receipt of the policy. On or about September 10, 2009, the claimant was fueling the forklift. He removed the key from the nozzle and got on the forklift before disengaging the fuel nozzle from the forklift. The employer terminated the claimant on September 10, 2009, for failure to follow procedures.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was 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). Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). 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).

Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions in the performance of the job. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to follow the employer's instructions and acting carelessly. He carelessly hit an electronic vehicle. He carelessly was unaware of a pedestrian when operating the forklift. He carelessly failed to remove a fuel nozzle before boarding his forklift. The claimant's repeated disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's September 25, 2009 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw