

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

FRANCIS J SCHNEIDER

Claimant,

and

FAREWAY STORES INC

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 11B-UI-11248

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-A

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. Two members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. Those members are not in agreement. Monique F. Kuester would affirm and John A. Peno would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge.

Since there is not agreement, the decision of the administrative law judge is affirmed by operation of law. The Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law of the administrative law judge are adopted by the Board and that decision is **AFFIRMED** by operation of law. See, 486 871 3.3(3).

Monique F. Kuester

DISSENTING OPINION OF JOHN A. PENO:

I respectfully dissent from the decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge. The claimant was a no call/no show on three occasions due to drug/alcohol-related arrests. The claimant was not suspended for these absences. Thus, any alleged drug/alcohol-related discipline would not (at this time) be considered a current act of misconduct. The court in Greene v. Employment Appeal Board, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa App. 1988) held that in order to determine whether conduct prompting the discharged constituted a “current act,” the date on which the conduct came to the employer’s attention and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that said conduct subjected the claimant to possible termination must be considered to determine if the termination is disqualifying. Any delay in timing from the final act to the actual termination must have a reasonable basis.

The employer suspended the claimant pending the outcome of the charges. The employer testified that if the claimant was found ‘not guilty’, he would probably *not* be discharged. For this reason, I would allow benefits provided he is otherwise eligible.

John A. Peno

AMG/kjo