

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JOSEPH P PERKINS
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-02687-M2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MIDWEST JANITORIAL SERVICE INC
Employer

OC: 12/19/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 28, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on March 29, 2011. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Greg Trosky.

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 having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was discharged on December 14, 2010 because the employer received credible reports that the claimant was chatting up and harassing female clients and patrons of the facility he was assigned to. Female customers reported the claimant would block doorways to prevent egress so that he could chat them up. Many of the employees of the theatre were under-aged, which heightened the concerns. The theatre manager reported the complaints to the employer, and added that the claimant, after checking her marital status, offered to perform a sexual act with her. Additionally, the claimant was watching movies at the theatre he was assigned to while on the clock.

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 gravity of the incident, number of policy violations, and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

In this matter, the evidence establishes that claimant was discharged on December 14, 2010 for acts of misconduct when claimant was discharged for harassment of customers (and customers of the customer) of the employer.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated February 28, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Stan McElderry
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

srm/kjw