

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

BARBARA S COOK  
653 – 5<sup>TH</sup> AVE S  
CLINTON IA 52732

APAC CUSTOMER SERVICES INC  
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS  
PO BOX 283  
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

AMENDED

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-07644-DT  
OC: 06/13/04 R: 04  
Claimant: Respondent (1)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

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.

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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

APAC Customer Services of Iowa, L.L.C. (employer) appealed a representative's July 1, 2004 decision (reference 01) that concluded Barbara S. Cook (claimant) was qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on August 6, 2004. The claimant participated in the hearing. Amber Neilson appeared on the employer's behalf. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on April 15, 2002. She worked full time as a telephone sales representative (TSR) in the employer's Clinton, Iowa outgoing telemarketing call center. Her last day of work was June 11, 2004. The employer discharged her on June 16, 2004. The reason asserted for the discharge was the allegation that the claimant had made a disparaging comparison between the employer's business client and Enron.

The employer could not establish when the claimant was to have made this call or what specifically the claimant was to have said in the call. The claimant denied ever making any disparaging comment regarding the business client. At best, she indicated it was possible that if she had a potential customer on the phone that might have made a comparative statement between the employer's client and Enron, she might not have challenged the customer's statement and might have made a sympathetic statement in an attempt to get the conversation back on track to discuss the client's products.

When the claimant was confronted on June 16 with the allegation, she disputed the claim and asked to hear a copy of the conversation. The employer indicated that it did not have a taped copy of the conversation. Apparently, the business client had been given the tape. No one who had even heard the tape participated in the hearing in order to provide more direct evidence as to who said what during the phone call.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the employer discharged the claimant for reasons establishing work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. The issue is not whether the employer was right to terminate the claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate questions. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988).

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code Section 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The focus of the definition of misconduct is on acts or omissions by a claimant that "rise to the level of being deliberate, intentional or culpable." Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The acts must show:

1. Willful and wanton disregard of an employer's interest, such as found in:
  - a. Deliberate violation of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of its employees, or
  - b. Deliberate disregard of standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of its employees; or
2. Carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to:
  - a. Manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design; or
  - b. Show an intentional and substantial disregard of:
    1. The employer's interest, or
    2. The employee's duties and obligations to the employer.

Henry, supra. The reason cited by the employer for discharging the claimant is the allegation that she had degraded the business client. However, the claimant denied having said anything to degrade the client. No first-hand witness, or even a witness that heard the tape, was available at the hearing to provide testimony to the contrary under oath and subject to cross-examination. The employer relies exclusively on the at least second-hand account from the business client; however, without that information being provided at least closer to first-hand, the administrative law judge is unable to ascertain whether the business client might have been mistaken as to what was said or even whether it was the claimant on the call. Under the

circumstances, the administrative law judge finds the claimant's first-hand information more credible. The employer has not met its burden to show disqualifying misconduct. Cosper, supra. Based upon the evidence provided, the claimant's actions were not misconduct within the meaning of the statute, and the claimant is not disqualified from benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's July 1, 2004 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The employer did discharge the claimant but not for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if she is otherwise eligible.

ld/b/b