

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

TERRY L BEEKMAN
1850 KELLY AVE
FT DODGE IA 50501

ELECTROLUX HOME PRODUCTS INC
FRIGIDAIRE
c/o TALX EMPLOYER SERVICES
PO BOX 1160
COLUMBUS OH 43216-1160

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-02150-BT
OC: 01/23/05 R: 01
Claimant: Appellant (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96 5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Terry Beekman (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 24, 2005, reference 01, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from Electrolux Home Products, Inc. (employer) for work-connected misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 16, 2005. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Amanda Wuest, Human Resources Generalist.

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 employed as a full-time laborer from January 10, 2003 through January 11, 2005. He was discharged for violation of both the attendance policy and the shop rule policy. The employer has an attendance point system and each employee starts with zero points and is automatically discharged once they reach ten points. The claimant received a verbal warning on November 4, 2004 and a written warning on December 9, 2004 advising him where he was at with his attendance points. He reached ten points on January 6, 2005 when he was absent due to a snowstorm and an asthma attack.

On January 11, 2005, the claimant was issued a fifth shop rule violation. The employer's policy provides that employees are discharged after receiving five violations. His first violation was on May 21, 2004 for violation of rule 13, which is horseplay. Two warnings were issued on October 26, 2004. He violated rule three by failing to report to work after breakfast, lunch or dinner and violated rule 15 by using abusive language, misconduct or other offensive personal actions. He was at his fourth violation on December 8, 2004 for another violation of rule three. The violation on January 11, 2005 was rule six which is unsatisfactory work or failure to maintain quality. The claimant knew he was going to be terminated because of his attendance points and was upset so was not working and his actions were slowing down production.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for repeated policy violations. He knew or should have known his job was in jeopardy because of the employer's policies and the number of violations he committed. The claimant's violation of known work rules was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 24, 2005, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

sdb/sc