

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DAVID D REDMOND
Claimant

KRAFT HEINZ FOODS COMPANY
Employer

APPEAL 18A-UI-06191-LJ-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 06/04/17
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the June 1, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged from work for fighting on the job. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 21, 2018. The claimant, David D. Redmond, participated and was represented by Jon Geyer. The employer, Kraft Heinz Foods Company, did not register a telephone number at which to be reached and did not participate in the hearing.

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 a bag line cook, from sometime in 2004 until May 15, 2018, when he was discharged. Three days prior to the end of claimant's employment, he was accused of being involved in an altercation in the workplace. Claimant explained that it occurred at the end of his shift. Claimant was in the process of updating someone on the next shift about the status of production, and this employee he was talking to blew up at him. The co-worker started yelling loudly and was upset. Claimant told this employee that he should talk to a supervisor. Claimant then started to walk away, and a supervisor came into the room and sent both claimant and the employee to HR. Claimant denies that he yelled at the other employee or engaged with him in a confrontational manner. Claimant had never been warned about anything similar in the past. He was not aware that his job was in any jeopardy at the time.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the 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.

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. Here, the employer did not participate in the appeal hearing or submit any documentation in lieu of in-person participation. Claimant denies that he was involved in the altercation that occurred, and the

employer has presented no evidence to show that he was involved. The employer has not met its burden of proving that claimant was discharged from employment for any disqualifying reason. Therefore, benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The June 1, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/scn