

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

LARRY WALKER
Claimant

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC
Employer

APPEAL 18A-UI-06445-DL-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 05/20/18
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the June 8, 2018, (reference 01), unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a discharge from employment. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on June 27, 2018. Claimant participated. Employer responded to the hearing notice instructions but was not available at the number provided when the hearing was called and did not participate.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time forklift operator. The separation date was May 9, 2018. On that date while claimant was driving his forklift-type vehicle ("mule") coworker Marcel became angry and unplugged the mule's battery, which caused claimant to crash. Marcel began yelling at claimant, grabbed his jacket, struck and pushed him. Claimant did not touch, hit or push him back, but attempted to get away from Marcel to find a supervisor. Marcel had a history of physical aggression. Both were discharged.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

Causes for disqualification.

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); accord *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

Misconduct "must be substantial" to justify the denial of unemployment benefits. *Lee*, 616 N.W.2d at 665 (citation omitted). "Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." *Id.* (citation omitted). ...the definition of misconduct requires more than a "disregard" it requires a "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." Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)(a) (emphasis added).

Whether an employee violated an employer's policies is a different issue from whether the employee is disqualified for misconduct for purposes of unemployment insurance benefits. See *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000) ("Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." (Quoting *Reigelsberger*, 500 N.W.2d at 66.)). Where a claimant participated in a confrontation without attempt to retreat, the Iowa Court of Appeals rejected a self-defense argument stating that to establish such a defense the claimant must show freedom from fault in bringing on the encounter, a necessity to fight back, and an attempt to retreat unless there is no means of escape or that peril would increase by doing so. *Savage v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 529 N.W.2d 640 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995).

The employer has an interest and duty in protecting the safety of all employees. Claimant met those expectations by retreating from Marcel's physical aggression and not engaging with him verbally. The employer discharged claimant for no disqualifying reason.

DECISION:

The June 8, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/rvs