

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

MARLENE S PEDERSEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 18A-UI-00799-S1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

DOLGENCORP LLC
Employer

OC: 12/10/17
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Marlene Pedersen (claimant) appealed a representative's January 11, 2018, decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits after her separation from employment with Dolgencorp (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for February 9, 2018. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Jeff Van Velzen, District 724 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 23, 2016, as a full-time store manager. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on May 1, 2017. The claimant understood the employer's standard operating practice of making a bank deposit once per day.

On August 11, 2017, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for failure to follow a number of company policies. One of the policies the claimant was not following was not making daily bank deposits. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in further corrective actions. On October 25, 2017, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for failure to follow company policies. Again, the claimant was not making daily bank deposits. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On October 25, 28, and 29, 2017, the claimant did not make daily bank deposits. She was busy and did not make the deposit and did not delegate the deposit to a qualified employee. On November 1, 2017, the claimant noticed the three deposit bags in the safe. She made the bank deposits for October 25, 28, and 29, 2017, on November 1, 2017. The claimant did not disclose this to the employer. On Friday, December 1, 2017, the employer discovered the claimant's

actions when it received the bank statement. On Monday, December 4, 2017, the employer terminated the claimant.

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. 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 January 11, 2018, decision (reference 01) 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