

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

NICOLAS G MOCTEZUMA
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-17249-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

REMBRANDT ENTERPRISES INC
Employer

**OC: 11/21/10
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Nicolas Moctezuma (claimant) appealed a representative's December 14, 2010 decision (reference 02) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Rembrandt Enterprises (employer) for loafing on the job. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for February 2, 2011. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Darla Thompson, Human Resource Manager.

ISSUE:

The issue is 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 February 28, 2006, as a full-time maintenance worker. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on August 3, 2009. On September 27, 2010, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for failure to notify the employer of an absence due to transportation issues. The employer notified the claimant that he would be terminated if he failed to report an absence in the future. The claimant only recalls a verbal warning.

On November 24, 2010, the employer terminated the claimant because it thought the claimant was loafing on the job. The claimant was not loafing but waiting for work as he did every day. The claimant was following the daily routine. Other employees slept on the job and were not terminated.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for 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.

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). If a party has the power to produce more explicit and direct evidence than it chooses to do, it may be fairly inferred that other evidence would lay open deficiencies in that party's case. Crosser v. Iowa Department of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976). The employer had the power to present testimony but chose not to do so. The employer did not provide first-hand testimony at the hearing and, therefore, did not provide sufficient eye witness evidence of job-related misconduct to rebut the claimant's denial of said conduct. The employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The representative's December 14, 2010 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs