

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DANIEL J SCHAFFER
Claimant

THRIVE TOGETHER LLC
Employer

APPEAL 23A-UI-08522-LJ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 07/23/23
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge from Employment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On September 7, 2023, employer Thrive Together LLC filed an appeal from the August 31, 2023 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits after the employer discharged claimant Daniel J. Schafer from employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephonic hearing was held at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, September 22, 2023. Claimant Daniel J. Schafer did not appear or participate. Employer Thrive Together LLC participated through witness Rose Hartz, General Manager of the Cedar Falls location; and Marlene Sartin, UC Advantage hearing representative. No exhibits were admitted into the hearing record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for disqualifying misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for this employer on June 15, 2021. Most recently, he worked part-time hours as a back of house/kitchen employee. Claimant's employment ended on July 6, 2023, when the employer discharged him for inappropriate behavior the day prior.

On July 5, claimant was working the dish room station in the kitchen. Someone brought over a cutting board with raw meat to be washed, which upset claimant. He screamed, "Fucking stop!" loudly enough that both employees and customers out in the restaurant area to hear him. The kitchen supervisor approached claimant to ask what happened, and he explained that he had post-traumatic stress disorder that was triggered by the raw meat. Claimant finished his shift that day. Hartz was notified about the incident the following day, and she discharged claimant.

Claimant had a pattern of resisting coaching or behaving abrasively when given feedback at work. On January 23, 2023, claimant became angry at work after a coworker found him against the wall with his head in his hands and asked what was wrong. The coworker raised up their hands, stepped back, and told Schafer to calm down. Later, the same coworker gave Schafer information about the Employee Assistance Program.

Three weeks prior to the discharge, claimant had raised their voice toward Hartz. She told them that they needed to bring their behavior under control and expressed that the employer would not tolerate that kind of behavior. Hartz did not formalize or document this warning. While claimant had a pattern of issues at work, Hartz did not want to add to perceived personal issues occurring with disciplinary actions.

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.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) and (d) provide:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

...

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "*misconduct*" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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 even 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

- (1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.
- (5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the

employer's employment policies, unless the individual is compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.

(6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.

(7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that results in missing work.

(8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.

(10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.

(11) Failure to maintain any license, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.

(12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.

(13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

(14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee.

The Iowa Court of Appeals found substantial evidence of misconduct in testimony that the claimant worked slower than he was capable of working and would temporarily and briefly improve following oral reprimands. *Sellers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 531 N.W.2d 645 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct.

Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co., 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a “wrongful intent” to be disqualifying in nature. *Id.* Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer’s interests. *Henry v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

“The use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context, may be recognized as misconduct, even in the case of isolated incidents or situations in which the target of abusive name-calling is not present when the vulgar statements are initially made. The question of whether the use of improper language in the workplace is misconduct is nearly always a fact question. It must be considered with other relevant factors, including the context in which it is said, and the general work environment.” *Myers v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). Vulgar language in front of customers can constitute misconduct, *Zeches v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 333 N.W.2d 735, 736 (Iowa Ct. App. 1983), as well as vulgarities accompanied with a refusal to obey supervisors. *Warrell v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 356 N.W.2d 587, 589 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).


Every employer is entitled to expect civility and decency from its employees, and an employee’s “use of profanity or offensive language in a confrontational, disrespectful, or name-calling context may be recognized as misconduct.” *Henecke v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 533 N.W.2d 573, 576 (Iowa App. 1995) (internal citation omitted). However, the use of profanity or offensive language is not automatically disqualifying for unemployment insurance benefits purposes. The “question of whether the use of improper language in the workplace is misconduct is nearly always a fact question... [and] must be considered with other relevant factors...” *Myers v. Employment Appeal Board*, 462 N.W.2d 734, 738 (Iowa App. 1990). An Employment Appeal Board decision set forth six aggravating factors to be considered when examining an employee’s use of improper language: “(1) cursing in front of customers, vendors, or other third parties; (2) undermining a supervisor’s authority; (3) threats of violence; (4) threats of future misbehavior or insubordination; (5) repeated incidents of vulgarity; and (6) discriminatory context.” Emp. App. Bd. Hrg. No. 16B-UI-08787, at *3 (Emp. App. Bd. pub. Oct. 21, 2016) (citing cases). The Employment Appeal Board also suggests that the general work environment is a relevant consideration in analyzing profanity. *Id.*

Here, the final incident involved claimant shouting a single profane word while working. This was not an action taken out of reasoned judgment but evidently something triggered by claimant’s PTSD. This statement was not made to undermine a supervisor’s authority; he was not threatening any immediate or future violence or insubordination; and nothing about the incident was discriminatory in nature. Additionally, while claimant had been informally coached about some of his behavior at work, he was never formally warned and had no notice that he needed to improve his behavior in order to retain his job. The evidence in the record does not establish that claimant was discharged for any disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

As benefits are allowed based on this separation, the issues of overpayment and chargeability are moot.

DECISION:

The August 31, 2023 (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment and chargeability are moot.



Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

September 25, 2023
Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/scn

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Employment Appeal Board
4th Floor – Lucas Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Fax: (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Employment Appeal Board
4th Floor – Lucas Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Fax: (515)281-7191
En línea: eab.iowa.gov**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiriera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.