

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**TAMMY L SIEGAL**  
Claimant

**GRANITE CITY RESTAURANT OPERATION**  
Employer

**APPEAL NO. 17A-UI-07159-B2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 06/25/17  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated July 14, 2017, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on July 31, 2017. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated through Kris Harmer. Employer's Exhibits 1-2 were admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

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

**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 employer on June 23, 2017. Employer discharged claimant on June 24, 2017 because claimant had shorted customers on their change for bills and had given the customers poor service after being warned.

Employer stated that claimant was often late or absent from work and did not follow proper company procedures if one was to be absent or late from work. Claimant stated that she was tardy from work on June 22, 2017 because of a flat tire on the way to work. Claimant did not follow company procedures in reporting the tardiness, but that was caused, at least in part because claimant was within the two hour advance notice window.

The last, most recent act that led to claimant's termination occurred on June 23, 2017 when claimant's table sent in a report to employer stating that claimant was rude and did not give customers correct change on their bills. Employer stated that claimant had previously received verbal warnings about the need for claimant to be more attentive to customers and their needs. Claimant denied ever receiving a verbal warning and stated instead that she'd given employer a 'heads up' about medication that she'd been taking and its effects. Claimant stated that employer asked if she needed time off during this period and claimant declined as she needed the money from work.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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).

A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982), Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

In order to establish misconduct as to disqualify a former employee from benefits an employer must establish the employee was responsible for a deliberate act or omission which was a material breach of the duties and obligations owed by the employee to the employer. Rule 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 275 N.W.2d 445 (Iowa 1979); *Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). The conduct must show a 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 the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Rule 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; *Huntoon supra*; *Henry supra*.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning quality of work. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant was verbally warned about her need to be more attentive to her job and to her customers. The customer's note to employer stated that claimant had a poor attitude and that claimant did not give proper change. Claimant stated at hearing that she thought the customer had told her she was just a dollar off regarding change due, when in fact it was \$1.45. This shows a lack of respect and attention to customers after a warning had been given. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated July 14, 2017, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Blair A. Bennett  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn