

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**ANDREW A KIEFFERT
2102 W 18TH ST
DAVENPORT IA 52804**

**BLOCKBUSTER INC
c/o SHEAKLEY UNISERVICE INC
PO BOX 1160
COLUMBUS OH 43216-1160**

**JEFFREY MCDANIEL,
ATTORNEY AT LAW
3725 BLACKHAWK RD
ROCK ISLAND IL 61201**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-11365-M
OC: 10/09/05 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated October 25, 2005, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on December 14, 2005 at Davenport. Claimant participated personally, represented by Jeffrey McDaniel, Attorney at Law with witness John Kiss. Employer participated by Toni Bowser, Store Manager, Daniel Furlong, District Leader. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for the employer September 16, 2005.

Employer discharged claimant on September 16, 2005 because claimant gave away free movie rentals when selling a promotional program. The free movie was for customers who provide an email address. Claimant gave them out as a sales incentive even though the customers did not have an email address due to customer complaints. Other customers in line would complain when they heard about the program and ask for the free rental even when they had no email address. Claimant was given a verbal warning by the employer sometime in mid August. After the warning claimant gave no more free credits on this program when no email address was provided. Claimant was on a final warning notice.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has failed to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated the employer's policy concerning customer credits on promotional program. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge fails to constitute misconduct because there is no final incident or current incident of misconduct. Claimant stopped giving credits on the program when confronted by the Store Manager. The only incidents for which the discharge was based were weeks old at the time of separation. The most recent incident that happened after the verbal warning by the Store Manager has not been proven by a preponderance of the evidence. Therefore, claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated October 25, 2005, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

mdm\pjs