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

JOHN L GILMORE	: :
Claimant,	: <b>HEARING NUMBER:</b> 09B-UI-13257
and	: EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
BTINC	: DECISION :
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, 96.3-7

### 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	
Enzasan E. Casa	
Monique F. Kuester	

# AMG/fnv

## 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 claimant had three late deliveries and one late pick-up, which was caused by his over-sleeping. He was late once in the Chicago area during the middle of the day that was caused by heavy traffic. (Tr. 19) The final act involved the claimant missing his exit. While the employer may have compelling business reasons to terminate the claimant, conduct that might warrant a discharge from employment will not necessarily sustain a disqualification from job insurance benefits. Budding v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 337 N.W.2d 219 (Iowa App. 1983). In the trucking business, there are always traffic delays and missed turns. In this case, the claimant's missing of the exit was not intentional. For this reason, I would conclude that misconduct was not established.

John A. Peno	

AMG/fnv