

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

JARET R SCHONBERG  
1229½ J AVE NE  
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52402

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

HY-VEE INC  
c/o TALX UCM SERVICES INC  
3799 VILLAGE RUN DR #511  
DES MOINES, IA 50317

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-06222-DT  
OC: 05/22/05 R: 03  
Claimant: Appellant (1)

**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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Jaret R. Schonberg (claimant) appealed a representative's June 6, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from Hy-Vee, Inc. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on June 30, 2005. The claimant participated in the hearing. David Williams of TALX UC eXpress appeared on the employer's behalf and presented testimony from four witnesses, Brent Heinz, Drew Nardy, Kim Genthe, and Jason Corey. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on April 12, 2002. He worked part time (35-40 hours per week) as a night stock clerk at the employer's Cedar Rapids, Iowa store. His last day of work was May 4, 2005. The employer discharged him on May 7, 2005. The stated reason for the discharge was providing false information regarding an absence.

The claimant had several prior attendance issues, at least for tardiness, and had received at least one verbal counseling. On May 6, 2005 the claimant was scheduled to work from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. He called the employer's store between 8:45 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. and spoke to Ms. Genthe. He reported that he was "stranded in the middle of nowhere" and had no ride, and so would not be in to work.

Mr. Corey, the night stock manager, came in at approximately 9:30 p.m. and was told about the claimant's call. He had previously heard that the claimant had a habit of calling in and claiming to be stranded when he did not want to work or had no ride and did not want to walk to work. He decided to go to the claimant's home and offer him a ride. He arrived at approximately 9:40 p.m. The claimant then came to the door, but was not interested in going to work, and in Mr. Corey's opinion, appeared to be under the influence of alcohol. The claimant asserted that he had not said he could not report for work because he was stranded, but because at the time he had called, he had been out of town without a ride and had had a stressful situation with his son and his ex. He further asserted that Mr. Corey had not come to his home until approximately 10:10 p.m. The claimant's testimony was not credible.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the employer discharged the claimant for reasons establishing work-connected misconduct. The issue is not whether the employer was right or even had any other choice but to terminate the claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). 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. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982); Iowa Code §96.5-2-a.

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).

The claimant's false claim that he was stranded and unable to get to work when in fact he was home at least 20 minutes before the start of his shift shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer discharged the claimant for reasons amounting to work-connected misconduct.

#### DECISION:

The representative's June 6, 2005 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The employer discharged the claimant for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as of May 7, 2005. This disqualification continues until the claimant has been paid ten times his weekly benefit amount for insured work, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account will not be charged.

ld/kjw