

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**KENNETH C JONES
28 GRANDVIEW AVE
COUNCIL BLUFFS IA 51503**

**COUNCIL BLUFFS – CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
ATTN MARGI PRICKETT
505 – 5TH ST STE 818
DES MOINES IA 50309**

**Appeal Number: 04A-UI-02915-LT
OC 02-15-04 R 01
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed a timely appeal from the March 10, 2004, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on April 6, 2004. Claimant did participate with Debra McGuire. Employer did participate through Jim Koch and Harold Russell and was represented by Paul Jahnke.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time night custodian crew supervisor through January 29, 2004 when he was discharged. On January 27 Brian Cihacek witnessed claimant leaving his 3:00 p.m. shift early at 5:27 p.m. without notice to his supervisor, Harold Russell, while reporting on his time

sheet he worked a full eight-hour shift. Debra McGuire, Art Teacher and Cheerleading Coach, often works after hours and saw claimant work on the weekends of January 10 and 24. January 27 was a snow day and the children did not have school. McGuire provided transportation to claimant that day and gave him a ride home when she left because he was ill. Russell yelled at her on January 28 and said, "if anyone on the night crew left early again the whole crew was going to be fired." Claimant did not leave early after that statement but was fired the next day. Others on the night custodian staff leave early and arrive late and there is no time clock. Claimant and Russell had made an agreement that claimant could take compensation time for working extra hours on the weekends or for sporting events. Russell did not know whether or not claimant had accumulated compensation time as of January 27.

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 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

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). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be “substantial.” When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a “wrongful intent” to be disqualifying in nature. Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. Miller v. Employment Appeal Board, 423 N.W.2d 211 (Iowa App. 1988).

Claimant and his supervisor had an arrangement about compensation time. Furthermore, on the final absence, claimant left early because he was ill. McGuire’s testimony is credible even though she is claimant’s friend, because she actually observed claimant on some of the dates at issue. Claimant had compensation time and took it as had been arranged and allowed in the past and others were not disciplined for the same type of situation. Thus, employer has failed to meet its burden of proof to establish disqualifying conduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The March 10, 2004, reference 01, decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

dml/b