

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

CONNIE K COLE
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-00855-PT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ALEGENT HEALTH
Employer

**OC: 12/12/10
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated January 14, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on February 21, 2011. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Sandy Lammers, Human Resource/Finance Coordinator, and Kathy Peckham, Operations Director for Patient Services. The employer was represented by Michelle Funk from TA;X. Claimant's Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence.

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 from May 7, 2007 through December 6, 2010 as a staff RN full time. She was discharged when the employer could no longer accommodate her work restrictions which were due to an injury sustained on this job.

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.

The claimant was discharged due to her inability to perform her job due to restrictions brought about by her work injury. This is not misconduct. No disqualification is imposed.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated January 14, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

Ron Pohlman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/css