

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

JAMES O HOWREN
Claimant

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-04305-DG-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 11/22/20
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.11 – Incarceration Disqualification

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the January 28, 2021, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 7, 2021. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Kristi Rossiter, Employment Manager. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Did claimant voluntarily leave the employment with good cause attributable to the employer or did employer discharge the claimant due to incarceration?
If claimant was discharged from the employment, was the separation because of job-related misconduct?
If claimant voluntarily quit the employment, were the reasons for quitting with good cause attributable to the employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time mechanic beginning on September 9, 2017. Claimant last worked for employer on October 17, 2020.

On October 18, 2020, claimant was arrested and charged with driving without a valid license. Claimant pleaded guilty to the charge and he was sentenced to pay a fine plus time served in jail.

The employer had a policy in place requiring claimant to notify the employer when they were going to be absent from work. The policy provided that claimant shall notify employer if he was going to be absent from work. Claimant missed work on October 18, October 19, and October 20, 2020. Claimant did not comply with this policy. He notified the employer of his absences after he was released from jail.

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. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. *Voluntary quitting.* If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.26(21) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(21) The claimant was compelled to resign when given the choice of resigning or being discharged. This shall not be considered a voluntary leaving.

Because there was unclear communication between claimant and employer about the interpretation of both parties' statements about the status of the employment relationship; the issue must be resolved by an examination of witness credibility and burden of proof. Since most members of management are considerably more experienced in personnel issues and operate from a position of authority over a subordinate employee, it is reasonably implied that the ability to communicate clearly is extended to discussions about employment status. Claimant established a desire to continue working within the company, claimant's interpretation of the conversation as a discharge was reasonable and the burden of proof falls to the employer.

Then, the question is whether the discharge was for any disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

Causes for disqualification.

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. *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).

Iowa Code section 96.5(11)a provides:

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

11. *Incarceration – disqualified.*

a. If the department finds that the individual became separated from employment due to the individual's incarceration in a jail, municipal holding facility, or correctional institution or facility, unless the department finds all of the following:

(1) The individual notified the employer that the individual would be absent from work due to the individual's incarceration prior to any such absence.

(2) Criminal charges relating to the incarceration were not filed against the individual, all criminal charges against the individual relating to the incarceration were dismissed, or the individual was found not guilty of all criminal charges relating to the incarceration.

(3) The individual reported back to the employer within two work days of the individual's release from incarceration and offered services.

(4) The employer rejected the individual's offer of services.

b. A disqualification under this subsection shall continue 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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). Further, excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer. See Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7). However, excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6, 10 (Iowa 1982). Disqualifying conduct cannot be predicated on a mere arrest unsupported by a conviction or other credible evidence of the claimant's intentional conduct. *Irving v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 883 N.W.2d 179 (Iowa 2016) (citing *In re Benjamin*, 572 N.Y.S.2d 970, 972 (App. Div. 1991)(per curiam)).

Based upon the evidence outlined above, claimant did violate the employer's reasonable reporting policy regarding absenteeism. Claimant's incarceration and his criminal acts were avoidable. As such, claimant's absenteeism was misconduct and his actions constitute a blatant disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of an employee. *Irving v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 883 N.W.2d 179 (Iowa 2016) (citing *State v. Evans*, 901 P.2d 156, 156-57 (Nev. 1995)). As such, the separation is disqualifying.

DECISION:

The January 28, 2021, (reference 02) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.



Duane L. Golden
Administrative Law Judge

April 19, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/ol

Note to Claimant:

If this decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits and you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits, but who are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>. If this decision becomes final, or if you are not eligible for PUA, you may have an overpayment of benefits.