

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**DAN S FULLER**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-03548-SWT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WOOD MARK LTD**  
Employer

**OC: 03/02/08 R: 04  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated April 3, 2008, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on April 24, 2008. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. Appeals 08A-UI-03548-SWT and 08A-UI-03547-SWT were consolidated for the purpose of hearing the case. Claimants, Dan Fuller and Justin Fuller participated in the hearing. Mark Martin participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence at the hearing.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The claimant was employed full time with the employer as a counter fabricator and installer from November 8, 2006, to February 29, 2008. Mark Martin was the claimant's supervisor.

Martin terminated the claimant on March 3, 2008, because he did not have work for the claimant and he was dissatisfied the claimant's job productivity. Martin determined that the claimant was taking considerably more time than the national average to install countertops.

The claimant performed his job to the best of his ability and never deliberately delayed or wasted time on the job. He had never been counseled regarding his job performance or productivity.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance 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 to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

No willful and substantial misconduct has been proven in this case. No repeated negligence has been shown. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated April 3, 2008, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

---

Steven A. Wise  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

saw/css