IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

LAMLAM B ARAYA

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-10845-H2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC

Employer

OC: 08-12-12

Claimant: Appellant (1)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the September 4, 2012, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 25, 2012. The claimant did participate with the assistance of Tigrinya interpreter, Michael Berhane. The employer did participate through Eloisa Baumgartner, Employment Manager. Employer's Exhibit One was entered and received into the record.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged due to job-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a production worker full time beginning August 14, 2006 through August 14, 2012 when she was discharged. The claimant left the line early on August 8 to go to break without permission. She had previously been warned in February 2012 about taking unauthorized breaks. She had numerous write ups for safety violations during her employment as illustrated by Employer's Exhibit One. The claimant knew or should have known that her own actions were placing her job in jeopardy. The claimant was discharged pursuant to the progressive disciplinary policy as the numerous warnings she had had placed her at the termination step. The claimant was fired only because she failed to follow the policies and the rules of the employer.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

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.

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.

Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (lowa App. 1990). Claimant's repeated failure to follow the employer's safety policies and attendance policies in the performance of her job duties after having been warned is evidence of carelessness to such a degree of recurrence as to rise to the level of disqualifying job related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

tkh/css

The September 4, 2012 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	