BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

ROBERT C FAUSETT	: : : HEARING NUMBER: 09B-UI-08026
Claimant,	
and	EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
KEYSTONE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRIES MN	:

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: 96.5-2-a

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board, one member dissenting, reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is AFFIRMED.

Elizabeth L. Seiser

AMG/fnv

Monique F. Kuester

DISSENTING OPINION OF JOHN A. PENO:

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge. The employer alleges that the claimant showed a female co-worker an inappropriate picture of female genitalia on his cell phone. The employer says the claimant admitted this allegation during an interview, which the claimant denies not only the allegation, but the admission as well.

871 IAC 24.32(4) provides:

Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. 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. In the cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

There were two other witnesses (female co-worker and the corporate Human Resources Director) who were involved in the alleged incident, yet neither person was presented as a witness at the hearing. Since the employer failed to provide any firsthand testimony, I would attribute more weight to the claimant's testimony and conclude that the employer failed to satisfy his burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. I would therefore allow benefits provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

John A. Peno