IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

BRADLEY A MULLER

Claimant

APPEAL 15A-UI-06556-DL-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SWIFT PORK CO

Employer

OC: 05/10/15

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the May 29, 2015, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon voluntarily quitting the employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on July 9, 2015. Claimant participated. Employer participated through human resource director, Pete Charboneau.

ISSUES:

Did claimant voluntarily leave the employment with good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as a production supervisor from January 24, 2014, and was separated from employment on May 15, 2015, when he quit. His last day of work was Friday, May 8, 2015. Jill, second shift superintendent, had engaged in name-calling and put-downs of claimant in front of subordinate employees and privately, calling him "dumb-ass, stupid, worthless piece of shit, f***ing idiot, and retard." This began two weeks after he was assigned to the position without prior experience and minimal training if he told her he did not know how to perform the task or asked her to repeat something. Most recently she became frustrated and angry with him and threw a "belly" at him, striking him, and "stormed off" in front of subordinates. Claimant reported the pattern of behavior to the human resource director and general manager and was told to get a thicker skin and that she may have a brash personality but she is a "woman in a man's world."

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant voluntarily left the employment with good cause attributable to the employer.

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(4) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(4) The claimant left due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(2) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(2) The claimant left due to unsafe working conditions.

A notice of an intent to quit had been required by *Cobb v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 506 N.W.2d 445, 447-78 (lowa 1993), *Suluki v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 503 N.W.2d 402, 405 (lowa 1993), and *Swanson v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 554 N.W.2d 294, 296 (lowa Ct. App. 1996). Those cases required an employee to give an employer notice of intent to quit, thus giving the employer an opportunity to cure working conditions. However, in 1995, the lowa Administrative Code was amended to include an intent-to-quit requirement. The requirement was only added to rule 871-24.26(6)(b), the provision addressing work-related health problems. No intent-to-quit requirement was added to rule 871-24.26(4), the intolerable working conditions provision. Our supreme court recently concluded that, because the intent-to-quit requirement was added to rule 871-24.26(6)(b) but not 871-24.26(4), notice of intent to quit is not required for intolerable working conditions. *Hy-Vee, Inc. v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 710 N.W.2d 1 (lowa 2005).

"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." *Myers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734 (lowa Ct. App. 1990). Inasmuch as an employer can expect professional conduct and language from its employees, claimant is entitled to a working environment without being the target of abusive, obscene, name-calling. An employee should not have to endure bullying or a public dressing down with abusive language directed at them, either specifically or generally as part of a group, in order to retain employment any more than an employer would tolerate it from an employee.

The second shift superintendent's verbal abuse and physical assault with a piece of product created an intolerable work environment for claimant that gave rise to a good-cause reason for leaving the employment.

DECISION:

The May 29, 2015, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant voluntarily left the employment with good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Dévon M. Lewis

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css