## IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

LEWANNE C PARIS Claimant

# APPEAL 24A-UI-07989-DZ-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

### CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY Employer

OC: 08/11/24 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Lewanne C. Paris, the claimant/appellant,<sup>1</sup> appealed the Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) September 4, 2024 (reference 01) unemployment insurance (UI) decision. IWD denied Ms. Paris REGULAR (state) UI benefits because IWD concluded the employer discharged her from employment on July 25, 2024 for wanton carelessness while performing her job. On September 11, 2024, the Iowa Department of Inspections, Appeals, and Licensing (DIAL), UI Appeals Bureau mailed a notice of hearing to Ms. Paris and the employer for a telephone hearing scheduled for September 25, 2024.

The administrative law judge held a telephone hearing on September 25, 2024. Ms. Paris participated in the hearing personally. Shayla Numic, attorney, represented Ms. Paris. The employer participated in the hearing through Michelle Hardy, manager. The administrative law judge admitted Department's Exhibit 1, Claimant's Exhibit A, and Employer's Exhibit 1 as evidence.

The administrative law judge concludes Ms. Paris is eligible for REGULAR (state) UI benefits based on how her job ended with this employer, as long as no other decision denies her UI benefits.

### ISSUE:

Did the employer discharge Ms. Paris from employment for disqualifying, job-related misconduct?

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Ms. Paris began working for the employer in early June 2024 at its Lincoln Way, Marshalltown, Iowa location. She worked as a full-time cashier/pizza preparer. Her employment ended on July 25, 2024.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Claimant is the person who applied for UI benefits. Appellant is the person or employer who appealed.

On July 18, Ms. Hardy gave Ms. Paris a final written warning for a \$62.07 cash shortage in her register drawer from July 16. Ms. Hardy did not believe the shortage was intentional, but she gave Ms. Paris a warning because of the employer's policy and because she had spoken with Ms. Paris once before about a shortage related to how Ms. Paris input lottery winnings. The employer's unwritten policy is any shortage of \$25.00 or more will result in discipline. Ms. Hardy explained the policy to Ms. Paris at the time of the write up. Ms. Paris denied any wrongdoing.

On July 24, Ms. Paris cash drawer was short \$62.70. Ms. Hardy did not believe the shortage was intentional. On July 25, Ms. Hardy terminated Ms. Paris' employment due to the cash shortage.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the employer discharged Ms. Paris from employment on July 25, 2024 for a reason that does not disqualify her from receiving UI benefits.

lowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) and (d) provide, in relevant part:

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.

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "misconduct" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

...

(13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct.<sup>2</sup> The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating Ms. Paris from employment, but whether she is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits.<sup>3</sup> Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 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 the employer fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, the employer incurs potential liability for UI benefits related to that separation. A decision about 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 of the employer's policy or rule 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.

Theft is misconduct under the explicit statutory definition of misconduct. In addition, the Iowa Supreme Court has found a single attempted theft to be misconduct as a matter of law.<sup>5</sup> Even the theft of a small value item can be misconduct. The Iowa Court of Appeals has found an employee who took a wasted \$10.00 container of soup from a dumpster was disqualified for misconduct.

In this case, Ms. Paris denies stealing from the employer and Ms. Hardy admits that the cash shortages were not due to any intentional act on the part of Ms. Paris. The employer has not established disqualifying, job-related misconduct on the part of Ms. Paris. So, she is eligible for REGULAR (state) UI benefits, as long as no other decision denies her UI benefits.

### **DECISION:**

The September 4, 2024 (reference 01) UI decision is REVERSED. The employer discharged Ms. Paris from employment on July 25, 2024 for a reason that does not disqualify her from receiving UI benefits. Ms. Paris is eligible for REGULAR (state) UI benefits, as long as no other decision denies her UI benefits.

finite gra

Daniel Zeno Administrative Law Judge

September 26, 2024 Decision Dated and Mailed

scn

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Ringland Johnson Inc. v. Employment Appeal Board, 585 N.W.2d 269 (Iowa 1998).

**APPEAL RIGHTS.** If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

#### Iowa Employment Appeal Board 6200 Park Avenue Suite 100 Des Moines IA 50321 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

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.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL 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.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <a href="https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf">https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf</a> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <a href="https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/">https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/</a>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or 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.

**Note to Claimant:** It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

#### SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

**DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN.** Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

#### Iowa Employment Appeal Board 6200 Park Avenue Suite 100 Des Moines IA 50321 Fax: (515)281-7191 En línea: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <u>https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf</u> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <u>https:///www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/</u>.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

**Nota para el reclamante:** es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

#### SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.