

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

**LEANN M BOHANAN**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 18A-UI-02147-JE-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**NPC INTERNATIONAL INC**  
Employer

**OC: 12/24/17  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the February 5, 2018, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on March 13, 2018. The claimant did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. Lyle McElfersh, General Manager, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a part-time production worker/customer service representative for NPC International (Pizza Hut) from July 10, 2015 to December 27, 2017. She was discharged for coming in early and leaving early. The claimant received a written warning July 10, 2017, and was sent home July 9, 2017, for refusing to do prep work for the following day.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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 proving disqualifying misconduct. *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 substantial and 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).

While the employer stated the claimant frequently arrived for work earlier than her scheduled shift and then left earlier than her shift ended, it could not provide any dates when that occurred or the dates of any warnings the claimant received about that behavior. Consequently, the administrative law judge must conclude the employer has not met its burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct as that term is defined by Iowa law. Therefore, benefits must be allowed.

**DECISION:**

The February 5, 2018, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Julie Elder  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/scn