

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

CHRISTOPHER J WHALEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 10A-UI-04018-ST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

IOC SERVICES LLC
Employer

OC: 02/07/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge
871 IAC 24.32(1) – Definition of Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed a department decision dated March 5, 2010, reference 01, that held he was discharged for misconduct on February 11, 2010, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on April 29, 2010. The claimant did not participate. Rachel Morrissey, Benefits/Risk Manager, participated for the employer.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge having heard the testimony of the witness, and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant worked as a full-time security officer from April 11, 2007 to February 11, 2010. The employer provided the claimant with its two-page harassment policy. The employer issued claimant warnings on October 29, 2008, and April 6, 2009 for inappropriate behavior toward his supervisor in violation of the harassment policy.

The employer issued claimant a letter of concern warning on February 4, 2010 for inappropriate behavior toward his supervisor. The claimant was instructed to refrain from contacting his supervisor. Several hours later, the claimant entered a work area outside the scope of his duties to make contact with his supervisor, and was discharged from employment.

The claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice.

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.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer has established that the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment on February 11, 2010, for repeated violations of his company harassment policy.

The claimant knew the employer harassment policy due to repeated warnings. The claimant defied the instruction issued to him to avoid supervisor contact on February 4, and his repeated violation for the same offense constitutes job disqualifying misconduct.

DECISION:

The department decision dated March 5, 2010, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for misconduct on February 1, 2010. Benefits are denied until the claimant requalifies by working in and being paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/pjs