

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SAUL R GURROLA
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 06A-UI-09786-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION**
Employer

**OC: 08/27/06 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Cargill Meat Solutions Corporation (employer) appealed a representative's September 22, 2006 decision (reference 01) that concluded Saul Gurrola (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on November 1, 2006. The claimant participated personally through Ike Rocha, Interpreter. The employer participated by Erica Bleck, Human Resources Associate.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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 April 14, 2003, as a full-time belly press operator. He suffered a work-related injury on August 24, 2006. On August 29, 2006, the claimant was working under restrictions. The employer told the claimant there was work available in the harvesting room. The claimant asked if there was work available anywhere else. The employer said there was work available in the curing room. The employer terminated the claimant for refusing work in the harvesting room even though the claimant never refused to go there.

The testimony of the employer and claimant was inconsistent. The administrative law judge finds the claimant's testimony to be more credible because the claimant was the only eye witness in the hearing.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 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). The administrative law judge concludes that the hearsay evidence provided by the employer is not more persuasive than the claimant's denial of such conduct. The employer has not carried its burden of proof to establish that the claimant committed any act of misconduct in connection with employment for which he was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. The claimant is allowed unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's September 22, 2006 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/cs