

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CHRISTINE A JOSEPHSON**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-04502-E2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WATTERS AUTOLAND INC**  
Employer

**Original Claim: 02/15/09  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated March 16, 2009, reference 01, which held the claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on April 16, 2009. The claimant participated personally and with attorney Anita Olsen. The employer participated by Thad Watters, Co-Owner, and Jamie Adams, Office Manager.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant last worked for employer on February 14, 2009.

The claimant was discharged by the employer because the employer decided that she could not do the job of office manager. The claimant represented she had experience as an office manager and had worked for a car dealership. The employer knew that a number of reports were not being timely filed. The employer was concerned that not having accurate information could be harmful to the business and risk its line of credit with GM. The employer offered training to the claimant on the accounting systems it was using. The employer discovered after discharge some checks and accounts were not properly deposited or posted. The claimant did not receive any written or verbal warnings.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations, and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer discharges her for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

For unemployment insurance purposes, misconduct amounts to a deliberate act and a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of a worker's contract of employment. Misconduct is a deliberate violation or disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has a right to expect from employees or is an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, unsatisfactory performance due to inability or incapacity, inadvertence

or ordinary negligence in isolated incidents, or good-faith errors in judgment or discretion are not deemed to constitute work-connected misconduct. 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a).

The evidence is clear that the claimant did not handle the job as office manager up to the expectations of the employer. This is not misconduct. There was also no specific last act of misconduct that the claimant committed. The inability to do the job when the claimant tried to do the job is not misconduct.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that the claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated March 16, 2009, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided the claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

James Elliott  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jfe/kjw