IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

DAMIR TAUBER
Claimant

TARGET CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-02561-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

OC: 01/19/14
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Damir Tauber (claimant) appealed a representative's February 25, 2014. decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Target Corporation (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for March 31, 2014. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Amy Mosley, Human Resources Business Partner.

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 September 6, 2005, as a full-time warehouse worker. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook. The employer issued the claimant a written warning on December 20, 2008, for a safety incident. That incident fell off the claimant's record after twelve months. On June 29, 2013, the employer issued the claimant written warnings for attendance due to properly reported medical absences and work performance. The claimant's work performance was reduced due to working conditions that were too warm, causing employees to drink more water and use the restroom frequently. On August 31, 2013, the employer issued the claimant a final written warning for the same issues contained in the June 29, 2013, warning. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment. On January 11, 2014, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for loafing. The employer said the claimant looked like he was sleeping when he was not. The claimant was performing light-duty work after a work-related injury. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment. On January 11, 2014, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for having three corrective actions in one year.

On January 21, 2014, the claimant was driving an order picker. Its throttle did not react causing the claimant to bump a parked cage cart. There was no property damage. This sort of bumping

happened at least once per week. The employer approached the claimant and talked about the incident. No investigation was performed. On January 25, 2014, the employer terminated the claimant.

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.

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 February 25, 2014, decision (reference 01) 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/css