## IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ASHLEY E BUSHBY Claimant

# APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-03032-VST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

WAL-MART STORES INC Employer

> OC: 01/09/11 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-A – Discharge for Misconduct

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated March 4, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on March 31, 2011. Claimant participated. The employer notified the agency in writing that it would not be participating in the hearing. The record consists of the testimony of Ashley Bushby.

#### ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witness and having considered all of the evidence in the record, makes the following findings of fact:

The claimant was employed as a full-time fitting room sales associate at the employer's store located in Waterloo, Iowa. The claimant was hired on May 28, 2010. Her last day of work was January 8, 2011. She was terminated on January 8, 2011. The reason for her termination was that she had pierced her lower lip.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 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.

## 871 IAC 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.

Misconduct that leads to termination is not necessarily misconduct that disqualifies an individual from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Misconduct occurs when there are deliberate acts or omissions that constitute a material breach of the worker's duty to the employer. The employer has the burden of proof to show misconduct.

The claimant was terminated because she had a facial piercing. The claimant did not know that facial piercings were prohibited by employer policy. She offered to place a clear piece in her lip instead but the employer would not accept this either. The claimant testified that other employees had identical piercings but were not terminated. The employer did not participate in the hearing. The administrative law judge concludes that there is insufficient evidence in this record to support a finding of misconduct. Benefits are allowed if the claimant is otherwise eligible.

## **DECISION**:

The decision of the representative dated March 4, 2011, reference 01, is reversed. Unemployment insurance benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Vicki L. Seeck Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

vls/css