

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**RANDA M FOX**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-14882-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WAL-MART STORES**  
Employer

**OC: 01/17/10  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the October 13, 2010, reference 03, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on December 8, 2010. Claimant participated. Mark Otto represented the employer and presented additional testimony through April Hayes. Exhibits One through Five were received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a sales floor associate until July 29, 2010, when the employer discharged her for a time clock irregularity. The incident in question occurred on July 16, 2010. Claimant was scheduled to work at 5:30 p.m. The claimant erroneously thought she was scheduled to work at 5:00 p.m. The claimant arrived at the workplace at 4:47 p.m. and went to eat at the McDonald's restaurant located inside the workplace. At 5:10 p.m., the claimant exited the McDonald's. At 5:12 p.m., the claimant used the employer's time clock system to clock in. The claimant received a message from the time clock system that she was attempting to clock in *early*. After stopping to chat with a coworker, the claimant reported to her workstation and saw that she was indeed scheduled to work at 5:30 p.m. Later in the shift claimant used the employer's time clock system to adjust her start time to 4:35 p.m. This was earlier than claimant's arrival at the workplace. The employer utilizes 24-hour military time on its time clock system. When the claimant adjusted her time, she intended to adjust it to 5:35 p.m., the time she actually arrived at her workstation. The claimant miscalculated the appropriate time to enter under the 24-hour military time system and erroneously entered a start time of 4:35 p.m., 16:35 instead of 17:35.

## 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.

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly

be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

The weight of the evidence in the record establishes that the claimant's erroneous timekeeping from July 16, 2010 resulted from an error in calculating the appropriate 24-hour military time, not from a willful or wanton intent to deceive the employer or received pay for more hours than she had worked. Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, the claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to the claimant.

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's October 13, 2010, reference 03, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/css