

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

RUSTIN D DAVENPORT
Claimant

ASPLUNDH TREE EXPERT CO
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-00242-JCT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 08/14/16
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:

The employer filed an appeal from the December 30, 2016, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 30, 2017. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Danny Watson, general foreman. Employer Exhibits 1 and 2 were received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can any 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 groundsman, beginning September 28, 2016 and was separated from employment on November 18, 2016, when he was discharged.

The claimant was discharged for his "failure to catch on" and because he was in his 90 day probationary period. The claimant was aware that he would be evaluated after 90 days of employment. Prior to discharge, he was unaware that his job was in jeopardy for any specific reason and had no prior written discipline. The employer cited to the claimant not catching on fast enough, foremen reporting they did not want to work with him, and a failure to secure a driver's license as reasons contributing to the discharge. The claimant was aware that he would have to obtain a driver's license per the employer's condition of employment (Employer Exhibits 1 and 2) but made the employer aware of his license status at hire and was not given any

deadline, requiring him to furnish one. The employer reported the claimant walked under a tree while it was being cut down, triggering the discharge.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$1760.00, since his separation date of November 18, 2016. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not attend the December 29, 2016 fact-finding interview or make a witness with direct knowledge available for rebuttal, but that its vendor (Talx) furnished a fax prior to the fact-finding interview to supplement participation.

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.

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).

"This is the meaning which has been given the term in other jurisdictions under similar statutes, and we believe it accurately reflects the intent of the legislature." *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 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 Department of Job Service*, 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. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa 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. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa 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." *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

It is the duty of the administrative law judge as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.* Assessing the credibility of the witnesses and reliability of the evidence in conjunction with the applicable burden of proof, as shown in the factual conclusions reached in the above-noted findings of fact, the administrative law judge concludes that the employer has not satisfied its burden to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(5) provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(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.

In this case, the claimant was discharged due to his failure to catch on quickly enough and while in his probationary period. The evidence presented does not support that the claimant was discharged for failure to secure a driver's license as he disclosed his license status upon hire, and no date was given to him that he was required to possess a license or be discharged. The employer cited to foremen not wanting to work with the claimant and the claimant on two occasions walking under trees being cut as specific incidents contributing to discharge. The claimant was not given any warning that his job was in jeopardy prior to discharge.

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). Based on the evidence presented, 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 inasmuch as he did attempt to perform the job to the best of his ability but was unable to meet its expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Casper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Accordingly, no disqualification pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a is imposed.

Nothing in this decision should be interpreted as a condemnation of the employer's right to terminate the claimant for violating its policies and procedures. The employer had a right to follow its policies and procedures. The analysis of unemployment insurance eligibility, however, does not end there. This ruling simply holds that the employer did not meet its burden of proof to establish the claimant's conduct leading separation was misconduct under Iowa law.

Because the claimant is eligible for benefits, the issues of overpayment and relief of charges are moot.

DECISION:

The December 30, 2016, (reference 02) decision is affirmed. The claimant was not discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has not been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits. The employer is not relieved of charges associated with this claim.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/rvs