

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

MONE B CHANTHAVONG
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-16876-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WEST LIBERTY FOODS
Employer

OC: 11/14/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Mone Chanthavong (claimant) appealed a representative's December 7, 2010 decision (reference 02) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with West Liberty Foods (employer) for dishonesty in connection with work. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for January 24, 2011. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Monica Dyar, Human Resource Supervisor. The employer offered and Exhibit One 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 July 1, 2008, as a full-time molder. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's most recent handbook on December 31, 2009.

On November 10, 2010, the claimant provided the employer with a note from a health care provider that had white out on it. The claimant admitted that she changed her return to work date because she was coughing and had strep throat. The employer terminated the claimant on November 11, 2010.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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). As persuasive authority, the falsification of an activity log book constitutes job misconduct. Smith v. Sorensen, 222 Nebraska 599, 386 N.W.2d 5 (1986). The claimant clearly disregarded the standards of behavior which an employer has a right to expect of its employees. The claimant's actions were

volitional. When a claimant intentionally disregards the standards of behavior that the employer has a right to expect of its employees, the claimant's actions are misconduct. The claimant was discharged for misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's December 7, 2010 decision (reference 02) 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/pjs