

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

AMBER L TOEPFER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-07266-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

FOCUS SERVICES LLC
Employer

**OC: 05/01/11
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the May 25, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on June 27, 2011. Claimant Amber Toepfer participated. Chris Hislop, human resources director, represented the employer.

ISSUES:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

Whether the discharge was based on a current act.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Amber Toepfer was employed by Focus Services as a full-time telephone sales agent from 2009 until December 2010, when the employer discharged her from the employment. Ms. Toepfer was pregnant at the time and had been on a medical leave associated with her pregnancy. The employer discharged Mr. Toepfer from the employment when Ms. Toepfer returned to the employer with a medical excuse. The employer cited a telephone call that Ms. Toepfer had allegedly handled a month earlier. The employer told Ms. Toepfer that Qwest wanted her off the account. The employer would ordinarily review problem telephone calls with employees, but refused Ms. Toepfer's request to review the call.

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 employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

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. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

The weight of the evidence fails to establish any misconduct in connection with the employment. The employer did not present testimony from any person with personal knowledge of the situation leading to Ms. Toepfer's discharge. The evidence fails to establish any carelessness, negligence, or intentional misconduct in connection with the phone call the employer alleged Ms. Toepfer mishandled. The evidence fails to establish that any problem with the telephone call would have constituted a current act at the time the employer notified Ms. Toepfer she was

discharged. The weight of the evidence supports Ms. Toepfer's assertion that there must have been some other non-disqualifying basis for the discharge.

Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Ms. Toepfer was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, Ms. Toepfer is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to Ms. Toepfer.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's May 25, 2011, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/kjw