

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

ESTIBI RIVERA
Claimant

APPEAL 19A-UI-06772-SC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CRESCENT ELECTRIC SUPPLY COMPANY
Employer

**OC: 07/28/19
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On August 26, 2019, Crescent Electric Supply Company (employer) filed an appeal from the August 15, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Estibi Rivera (claimant) was not discharged for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 19, 2019. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. The employer participated through District Manager Shane Madison and Branch Manager Ron Brimeyer. The employer's Exhibit 1 was admitted into the record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, specifically the fact-finding documents and the claimant's claim history.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a Warehouse Manager beginning on June 25, 2018, and was separated from employment on August 15, 2019, when he was discharged. The claimant's job performance during his tenure never met the employer's expectations.

On July 1, 2019, the claimant received a final written warning related to his job performance. There were incidents in the warehouse on June 24 and June 25 that led to customer complaints. The employer identified the issues leading to the incidents as a lack of organization and planning the warehouse. The claimant was told his job performance needed to improve to company expectations or he could be discharged.

Branch Manager Ron Brimeyer continued to receive customer complaints about warehouse issues after the final warning. The decision was made to discharge the claimant due to his unsatisfactory work performance.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1,576.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of July 28, 2019, for the five weeks ending August 31, 2019. The employer failed to participate in the fact-finding interview because Brimeyer's phone was experiencing technical issues and no alternate number was provided to the agency where he could be reached.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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 provides, in relevant part:

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.

...

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge.

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

(5) Trial period. A dismissal, because of being physically unable to do the work, being not capable of doing the work assigned, not meeting the employer's standards, or having been hired on a trial period of employment and not being able to do the work shall not be issues of misconduct.

...

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

This definition of misconduct 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).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979). Where an individual is discharged due to a failure in job performance, proof of that individual's ability to do the job is required to justify disqualification, rather than accepting the employer's subjective view. To do so is to impermissibly shift the burden of proof to the claimant. *Kelly v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Since the employer agreed that the claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which he performed his job duties to employer's satisfaction and there is no indication he was intentionally performing his job poorly, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. Accordingly, benefits are allowed.

As benefits are allowed, the issue of overpayment is moot and charges to the employer's account cannot be waived.

DECISION:

The August 15, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. As benefits are allowed, the issue of overpayment is moot and charges to the employer's account cannot be waived.

Stephanie R. Callahan
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/rvs