

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

DARLENE V ECKERMAN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 18A-UI-03032-S1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HY-VEE INC
Employer

OC: 02/04/18
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Darlene Eckerman (claimant) appealed a representative's March 1, 2018, decision (reference 02) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits after her separation from employment with Hy-Vee (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for April 2, 2018. The claimant participated personally. The employer was represented by Lisa Harroff, Hearings Representative, and participated by Beau Van Gelder, Assist Director of Perishables, and Melissa Box, Human Resources Manager. The employer offered and Exhibit 1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on January 28, 2017, as a part-time cashier. She signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on January 28, 2017, and the employer's code of conduct and front end expectations on February 4, 2017.

On August 30 and November 18, 2017, the employer issued the claimant written warnings for failure to follow instructions with regarding to taking payment from customers. The claimant accepted a check from customers and then returned the checks to those customers before they left. The employer received no payment for the items. Previously, the claimant worked for another employer who returned checks to customers after purchase. On January 5, 2018, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for failure to follow instructions. An order was not cashed out before the customer left with the items. The customer did not pay for the items before the customer left the store. The employer notified the claimant each time that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On February 3, 2018, the claimant did not pay attention to the customer at her register. The customer walked in front of and beside the claimant as the claimant stood at her register. The

claimant became aware of the absence of the customer after the customer left the store. The store was not paid \$23.80 for the customer's items. On February 3, 2018, the employer terminated the claimant for repeated failure to follow instructions and secure the employer's assets.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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 Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions in the performance of the job and secure the employer's assets. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to follow the employer's

instructions. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's March 1, 2018, decision (reference 02) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/rvs