

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

JACOB C KNAPP
504 E ADAMS
JEFFERSON IA 50129

HY-VEE INC
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

HY-VEE INC
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
3977 VILLAGE RUN DR #511
DES MOINES IA 50317

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-03031-LT
OC: 04-04-05 R: 01
Claimant: Appellant (5)

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)

Iowa Code §96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed a timely appeal from the March 10, 2005, reference 05, decision that denied benefits based upon a separation date of January 9, 2005. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on April 11, 2005. Claimant did participate. Employer did participate through Jon Johnson and Chad McCorkell and was represented by David Williams of TALX UC eXpress. Deb Powell observed.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a part-time meat clerk from September 20, 2004 through January 24, 2005 when he was discharged. On January 24, 2005 claimant removed pork bratwurst from the shelf, put it in a bucket, went to the kitchen to talk to employees, and left the store without

paying for it. Unauthorized removal of company property without payment is grounds for immediate termination pursuant to company policy.

Claimant did not intend to appeal the denial of benefits based upon the January 24, 2005 separation but did appeal the overpayment for the one week ending January 15, 2005 (appeal number 05A-UI-03032-LT) as he was still working for Hy-Vee but at reduced hours and claimed partial benefits for that one week.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related 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).

Claimant's removal of the bratwurst without paying for it was misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The March 10, 2005, reference 05, decision is modified without change in effect. The claimant was discharged from employment on January 24, 2005 due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

dml/pjs