# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**KENNETH S HAZELWOOD** 

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-07343-H2T** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

MORTON BUILDINGS INC

**Employer** 

OC: 03-18-12

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the June 21, 2012, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on July 13, 2012. The claimant did participate. The employer did not participate.

# ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged due to job connected misconduct?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a crew member, full-time, beginning in May 2012 through May 30, 2012, when he was discharged because he was not meeting the employer's expectations. The claimant performed the job to the best of his ability but was not able to ever meet the employer's expectations.

# **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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.

Failure in job performance due to inability or incapacity is not considered misconduct because the actions were not volitional. *Huntoon v. lowa Department of Job Service*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (lowa 1979). Where an individual is discharged due to a failure in job performance, proof of that individual's ability to do the job is required to justify disqualification, rather than accepting the employer's subjective view. To do so is to impermissibly shift the burden of proof to the claimant. *Kelly v. IDJS*, 386 N.W.2d 552 (lowa App. 1986). Since employer agreed that claimant had never had a sustained period of time during which he performed his job duties to employer's satisfaction and inasmuch as he did attempt to perform the job to the best of his ability but was unable to meet the employer's expectations, no intentional misconduct has been established, as is the employer's burden of proof. *Cosper v. IDJS*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982). Accordingly, no disgualification pursuant to lowa Code § 96.5(2)a is imposed.

# **DECISION:**

tkh/kjw

The June 21, 2012 (reference 01) decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	