

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

ERIN JORGENSEN  
6101 SW CRESTON  
APT 18  
DES MOINES IA 50321

WAL-MART STORES INC  
c/o FRICK UC EXPRESS  
PO BOX 283  
ST LOUIS MO 63166

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-08579-ET  
OC: 07-17-05 R: 02  
Claimant: Respondent (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/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the August 8, 2005, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on September 6, 2005. The claimant participated in the hearing with Customer Service Manager Veronica Kase. Melissa Sams, Front End Manager and Pat Danylchuck, Assistant Manager, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a part-time cashier/service desk employee for Wal-Mart from May 24, 2005 to July 13, 2005. The claimant was experiencing a high-risk pregnancy and told the scheduling manager and Customer Service Manager Veronica Kase that she could not stand on her feet for a full eight-hour shift and consequently she was given permission to come in two hours later than her regularly scheduled shift. Other members of management were apparently unaware of that arrangement and therefore believed the claimant was absent or tardy June 12, 19 and 20; July 2, 6, 7, 9 and 10, 2005. The employer does not issue disciplinary warnings to employees in their first 90 days so the claimant did not receive any warnings about her attendance and was not aware her job was in jeopardy until her employment was terminated July 13, 2005.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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 employer has the burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct. 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 willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). The claimant and the current customer service manager credibly testified that the claimant had permission to report for work later than her scheduled shift due to the fact she could not stand for eight hours because of her high-risk pregnancy. It is not clear why the front end and assistant manager were not aware of that arrangement but it seems that if the employer's policy allowed warnings to employees during their first 90 days, the employer would have learned how the claimant, customer service manager, and scheduling manager were handling the situation and the claimant would have learned that the employer was counting that time as unexcused. Without any warnings the claimant did not know her job was in jeopardy. Consequently, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's actions do not constitute disqualifying job misconduct as defined by Iowa law. Benefits are allowed.

#### DECISION:

The August 8, 2005, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

je/pjs