

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**NAZIF ROSIC**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-11729-MT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**BEEF PRODUCTS INC**  
Employer

**Original Claim: 06/21/09  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated July 28, 2009, reference 02, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on September 2, 2009. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Jennifer Stubbs, Human Resource Benefits Supervisor, and Rick Wood, Human Resource Manager. Exhibits One and A were admitted into evidence.

**ISSUES:**

Whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Whether the appeal is timely.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on June 22, 2009.

Claimant was discharged on June 22, 2009 by employer because claimant pushed and kicked a supervisor after an order to clean a tank. When questioned about the incident, claimant refused to answer whether he had assaulted the supervisor. Two other witnesses verified that the incident occurred. Claimant denied the incident at hearing. Claimant had a warning on his record January 23, 2009. Claimant was informed of rule number seven, which calls for discharges for any act of violence.

Claimant delayed the appeal because he does not read English. Claimant immediately appealed when he discovered that benefits had been cut off. Claimant did not understand the decision until he went to the Workforce Development office and appealed August 17, 2009.

## 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(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations, and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning workplace violence. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant engaged in violent behavior in the workplace. This is an intentional violation of a known company rule. The violent act endangered claimant and other workers. The statements of employer witnesses are more credible because claimant refused to answer questions at the time of the incident in June. This violated a duty owed the employer and all other workers. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code section 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 appeal is timely because claimant appealed upon actual notice of an adverse decision. Claimant appealed when he discovered benefits had ceased. The appeal is timely. Claimant does not read the English language. The appeal is timely, as it was made on the first date of actual notice of an adverse decision.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated July 28, 2009, reference 02, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Marlon Mormann  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/kjw