# BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD

Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

:

**QUINTIN H WYATT** 

**HEARING NUMBER: 15B-UI-08148** 

Claimant

.

and

EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD

**DECISION** 

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Employer

#### NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a request for a REHEARING is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within 20 days of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION:** 96.5-2A

#### DECISION

## UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. A majority of the Appeal Board, one member dissenting, finds it cannot affirm the administrative law judge's decision. The majority of the Employment Appeal Board **REVERSES** as set forth below.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Quintin Wyatt (Claimant) worked for the University of Iowa (Employer) as a part-time cashier from August 1, 2008 until he was fired on April 29, 2015. On April 16, 2015, the Claimant was observed leaving work with a small container of nacho cheese for which he had not paid. The Employer has a policy that any theft or unauthorized use of the Employer's property will always result in termination. The Employer trains on policies every year. An investigation was conducted, including reviewing surveillance footage, and it was concluded the Claimant had violated the employer's policy. The Claimant was then fired

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) (2015) provides:

*Discharge for Misconduct*. If the department finds the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and been paid wages for the insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

The Division of Job Service defines misconduct at 871 IAC 24.32(1)(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 the 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 is the meaning which has been given the term in other jurisdictions under similar statutes, and we believe it accurately reflects the intent of the legislature." *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 275 N.W.2d, 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Board*, 616 NW2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

It is the duty of the Board, as the ultimate trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The Board, as the finder of fact, may believe all, part or none of any witness's testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, as well as the weight to give other evidence, a Board member should consider the evidence using his or her own

observations, common sense and experience. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In determining the facts, and deciding what evidence to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other evidence the Board believes; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness's conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness's interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). The Board also gives weight to the opinion of the Administrative Law Judge concerning credibility and weight of evidence, particularly where the hearing is in-person, although the Board is not bound by that opinion. Iowa Code §17A.10(3); *Iowa State Fairgrounds Security v. Iowa Civil Rights Commission*, 322 N.W.2d 293, 294 (Iowa 1982). The findings of fact show how we have resolved the disputed factual issues in this case. We have carefully weighed the credibility of the witnesses and the reliability of the evidence considering the applicable factors listed above, and the Board's collective common sense and experience. We have found the Claimant's testimony that he intended to pay for the cheese to be not credible. This is based in part in the Claimant's admission to the Employer that he had taken the cheese – not that he'd made a mistake, but that he had taken it. We find that the Claimant took the cheese intentionally.

Theft from an employer is generally disqualifying misconduct. *Ringland Johnson Inc. v. Employment Appeal Board*, 585 N.W.2d 269 (Iowa 1998). In *Ringland* the Court found a single attempted theft to be misconduct as a matter of law. Even the theft of a item of negligible value a single time can be misconduct. Thus in *Tompkins-Kutcher v. EAB*, 11-0149 (Iowa App. 8/24/2011) a Casey's employee who took a wasted \$10 container of soup from dumpster was disqualified for misconduct. Value is thus not the issue. As the Court did in *Ringland Johnson* and *Tompkins-Kutcher*, we disqualify for the Claimant's actions even though not a lot of money is involved. Even though only one instance of theft is proven, such an action cannot be an isolated instance of a good faith error of judgment because it is not a good faith action. All benefits are denied until the Claimant has regualified.

#### **DECISION:**

The administrative law judge's decision dated August 13, 2015 is **REVERSED**. The Employment Appeal Board concludes that the Claimant was discharged for disqualifying misconduct. Accordingly, he is denied benefits until such time 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. See, Iowa Code section 96.5(2)"a".

The Board remands this matter to the Iowa Workforce Development Center, Claims Section, for a calculation of the overpayment amount based on this decision.

Kim D. Schmett		
Ashley R. Koopmans		 

# DISSENTING OPINION OF JAMES M. STROHMAN:

I respectfully dissent from the majority	decision of the	Employment	Appeal	Board; I	would	affirm	the
decision of the administrative law judge in	n its entirety.						

James M. Strohman

AMG/fnv