

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

EUGENE L GUY
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-08653-MT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

LENSCRAFTERS INC
Employer

**OC: 08/12/07 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated September 5, 2007, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on September 25, 2007. Claimant participated personally with witnesses Judith Stewart and Paul DeWaele. Employer participated by Eugenia Kinman, Hearing Representative, TALX, and witness Genia Bogart, Regional Quality Control Coordinator. Exhibits A and One were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on August 10, 2007.

Claimant was discharged on August 10, 2007 by employer because claimant failed to complete and sign off on safety inspections. The inspections were to be conducted monthly by company personnel. Claimant was to see that the inspections were performed. Claimant did not sign off on the inspections sheet. Claimant did not properly manage the inspections. Employer performed an audit July 25, 2007 and discovered the discrepancies. Claimant was not suspended pending the investigation. Employer delayed the discharge for two full weeks for administrative reasons.

Claimant had a final warning on his record July 11, 2007.

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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning safety inspections. Claimant was given a final warning concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct because there is no current act of misconduct. The employer was aware of the policy violation on July 25, 2007. Employer did not suspend claimant pending the investigation. Claimant was allowed to work without restriction. Employer delayed the discharge for administrative reasons. The last event is too stale to constitute a current act of misconduct. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated September 5, 2007, reference 01, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/kjw