

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TRACY R TONEY
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-04777-LT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

TARGET CORPORATION
Employer

**OC: 03/06/11
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Leaving

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the March 31, 2011 (reference 01) decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on May 6, 2011. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Larry Allen and Laura Hollingsworth.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer or if she was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant most recently worked part time as a photo lab team member from November 2009 and was separated from employment on March 4, 2011. Claimant transferred from an Iowa store to a Texas store on March 3, 2011. Photo lab assistant Holly provided her with no training when claimant observed that the machine was different than the ones she had used in Iowa. Holly told her to “wing it” and read the instruction manual. When asked to cashier during the shift she said she was confused because she would have gotten in trouble for leaving the photo lab unattended in the Iowa store. She was not given a copy of the job description when she transferred and was not introduced to an immediate supervisor. She had called the integrity hotline at 2:30 a.m. on her first shift about having been treated badly and receiving no training.

She called and spoke with Allen the morning of March 4 and tried to explain to him that she was upset because the machines were different than the ones she had used in Iowa, she did not know how to run them, and training was not available. He told her someone would call her later. Hollingsworth called her later and after she explained what she had told Allen and her confusion about leaving the photo lab to cashier, for which she would have gotten in trouble for in Iowa, Hollingsworth accused her of not being a team player and said this would be her last day.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did not quit but was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 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.

871 IAC 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.

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.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980). Where a claimant walked off the job without permission before the end of his shift saying he wanted a meeting with management the next day, the Iowa Court of Appeals ruled this was not a voluntary quit because the claimant's expressed desire to meet with management was evidence that he wished to maintain the employment relationship. Such cases must be analyzed as a discharge from employment. *Peck v. EAB*, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa App. 1992).

Employer clearly initiated the communication with claimant to complain about her availability by phone that evening. 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. Because 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. Since the employer took claimant's questions about a lack of training and change in job duties from one store to another as a resignation, and told her that it would be her last day, claimant's interpretation of the conversation as a discharge was reasonable and the burden of proof falls to the employer.

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 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. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa 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. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa 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." *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. Inasmuch as claimant was simply asking for training and clarification of what the employer expected from her, employer has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant engaged in misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The March 31, 2011 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. Claimant did not quit but was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css