

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

GRANT W CARSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-11163-S1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CURRAN TRANSFER INC
Employer

**OC: 08/23/15
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit
Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Grant Carson (claimant) appealed a representative's September 10, 2015, decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he voluntarily quit work with Curran Transfer (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for October 20, 2015. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by William Hayes, Territory Vice President, and Sandra Sander, Accounting Clerk. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal was filed in a timely manner and, if so, whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on November 3, 2014, as a part-time driver. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on November 9, 2014. The employer issued the claimant a written warning on January 21, 2015, for hitting a parked car in a parking lot on January 17, 2015. On March 20 and May 4, 2015, the employer issued the claimant written warnings for catching his clothing on the fuel door and breaking the gas cap cover. The claimant admitted that all three incidents could have been avoided. The employer notified the claimant each time that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On August 21, 2015, the claimant was driving in a construction zone and reached for his cellphone. In doing so he swerved to the left and hit a construction barricade, breaking the driver's side mirror. The employer terminated the claimant on August 21, 2015.

A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on September 10, 2015. He did not receive the decision within ten days. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by September 21, 2015. The claimant visited the IWD office on October 6, 2015, and discovered the decision. The appeal was filed on October 6, 2015, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the claimant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The claimant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

The next issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. The administrative law judge concludes he was.

Iowa Code § 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.

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. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Negligence does not constitute misconduct unless recurrent in nature; a single act is not disqualifying unless indicative of a deliberate disregard of the employer's interests. *Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 391 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa App. 1986). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions in the performance of the job and to protect the employer's assets. The claimant disregarded the employer's rights by repeatedly failing to protect the employer's property. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The September 10, 2015, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was timely. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs