

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

JESSE M ALDRIDGE
Claimant

ERJ DINING IV LLC
Employer

APPEAL 16A-UI-06144-NM-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 05/08/16
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the May 26, 2016 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon his discharge for violation of a known company rule. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 24, 2016. The claimant Jesse Aldridge participated and testified. The employer, ERJ Dining IV LLC, participated through hearing representative Audrey Harley and area manager Aaron Kurt. Employer's Exhibits One through Four were received into evidence.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full time as a manager from February 4, 2015 until this employment ended on May 10, 2016, when he was discharged.

On May 7, 2016, Kurt found out about a Facebook post involving claimant and two of his subordinates. The formatting of the post led Kurt to believe claimant and his two subordinates were friends on Facebook. (Exhibit One.) The employer's social media policy, which claimant was aware of, prohibits members of management from being friends with their subordinates on social media. Prior to this claimant had received several other warnings for policy violations unrelated to the social media policy or appropriate interactions with his subordinates. A meeting was held with claimant to discuss the situation on May 10, 2016. Claimant denied he had violated the policy. The decision was made during this meeting to terminate claimant's employment based on this incident and his prior disciplinary history and performance.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

The employer terminated claimant's employment when he violated the social media policy by becoming friends with his subordinates on social media. Though the claimant denies this allegation, the administrative law judge finds, after assessing the credibility of the witnesses who testified during the hearing, reviewing the exhibits submitted by the parties, and using her own common sense and experience, that he is not credible. Nevertheless, the conduct for which claimant was discharged was merely an isolated incident of poor judgment.

An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. Training or general notice to staff about a policy is not considered a disciplinary warning. While claimant had received prior warnings for other policy violations, he had never been warned about violating the social media policy or other policies similar in nature. Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about the issue leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning.

DECISION:

The May 26, 2016 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

Nicole Merrill
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

nm/can