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

| AMANDA J ATTEBERRY |                                |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Claimant,          | : HEARING NUMBER: 09B-UI-11202 |
| and                | EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD        |
| ARBY'S             | :                              |

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

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 was discharged based on an anonymous customer complaint that came in between 3:00-6:00 p.m. Supposedly, the customer asked another employee for the claimant's name. That employee relayed the incident to Ted, the shift manager, who did not testify. When the employer spoke with Ted at that time, Ted was vague in his description of what happened. The employer had no firsthand witness and the claimant denied cussing at the hearing. For this reason, I would conclude that the employer failed to prove their case by a preponderance of the evidence.

John A. Peno

AMG/fnv