

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

WILLIAM E CHEEK
Claimant

ERLBACHER BROS INC
Employer

APPEAL 16A-UI-13103-LJ-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 11/13/16
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a – Definition of Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the December 5, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged from employment for violation of a known company rule. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on December 29, 2016. The claimant, William E. Cheek, participated. The employer, Erlbacher Bros, Inc., participated through Dean Erlbacher, owner.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time, most recently as an over-the-road driver, from February 15, 2016, until July 20, 2016, when he was discharged for failing to maintain a commercial driver's license ("CDL").

Approximately one day before claimant was discharged, Erlbacher discovered that claimant had come up 37 hours late on delivering a load. He got ahold of a woman closely connected to claimant, and the woman opined that perhaps Erlbacher should look for claimant in jail, as his CDL had been suspended. Erlbacher then ran claimant's motor vehicle report and confirmed that claimant did not have an active, valid CDL. When Erlbacher located claimant, claimant confirmed that his CDL had been suspended. At that point, Erlbacher discharged claimant. Claimant admits he performed work for the employer while having a suspended CDL.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying misconduct. Benefits are withheld.

Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986).

The employer is entitled to establish reasonable work rules and expect employees to abide by them. Claimant did not rebut employer's reason for the separation and the failure to maintain his commercial driver's license as a known condition of the employment was misconduct. Therefore, benefits are withheld.

DECISION:

The December 5, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/