

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SUSANN V DELGADO
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UCFE-00023-PT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

US POSTAL SERVICE
Employer

OC: 04/03/11
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 April 27, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on June 9, 2011. Employer participated by Angie Pettinger, labor relations manager. Claimant did participate.

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 was employed from May 8, 1999 through April 4, 2011. On April 4, 2011, claimant was suspended after a co-worker reported that the claimant had made a threatening comment to him. Claimant denies making this comment and asserts that it was the co-worker who had threatened her. She did not report the threat from this co-worker because prior reports of threatening behavior towards her had not resulted in discipline to the co-workers.

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(9) provides:

(9) Suspension or disciplinary layoff. Whenever a claim is filed and the reason for the claimant's unemployment is the result of a disciplinary layoff or suspension imposed by the employer, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct must be resolved. Alleged misconduct or dishonesty without corroboration is not sufficient to result in disqualification.

The employer has not proven that the claimant threatened her co-worker. Her credible sworn testimony is entitled to more weight than the unsworn hearsay offered by the employer. No disqualification is imposed.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated April 27, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Ron Pohlman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/kjw