

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ADESSA A KNICKERBOCKER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-07519-S1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SMITHFIELD FARMLAND CORP
Employer

OC: 06/05/16
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Smithfield Farmland (employer) appealed a representative's June 28, 2016, decision (reference 02) that concluded Adessa Knickerbocker (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for July 27, 2016. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated by Danielle O'Neel, Assistant Human Resources Manager. The claimant offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

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 hired on August 13, 2008, and at the end of her employment she was working as a full-time production supervisor. The employer has a handbook but it is unclear whether the claimant ever received it. The claimant was a certified forklift operator as of December 2, 2015. She learned that she could not lift someone up on the forks of a forklift.

On March 12, 2016, the claimant was trying to get boxes down with her forklift. A subordinate, whose first language is not English, walked by the forklift. The claimant asked him to help her reach the boxes. The subordinate did not take over the forklift as the claimant expected. He climbed on the tines of the forklift and knocked down the boxes. The employer terminated the claimant because the subordinate climbed on the tines of the forklift. The employer did not terminate the subordinate.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of June 5, 2016. The employer participated personally at the fact-finding interview on June 24, 2016, by Danielle O'Neel.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for misconduct.

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).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). If a party has the power to produce more explicit and direct evidence than it chooses to do, it may be fairly inferred that other evidence would lay open deficiencies in that party's case. Crosser v. Iowa Department of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976). The employer had the power to present testimony but chose to rely solely on the written statements. The employer did not provide first-hand testimony at the hearing. The three statements did not provide the same information. Without being able to examine the witnesses, the statements are insufficient to rebut the claimant's denial of said conduct. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The representative's June 28, 2016, decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The employer has not met its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs