

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

ANNETTE SPIGHT
Claimant

HY-VEE INC
Employer

APPEAL 23A-UI-09872-AR-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 09/24/23
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On October 16, 2023, the claimant filed an appeal from the October 10, 2023, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based on the determination that claimant was discharged for disqualifying misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was initially scheduled for November 2, 2023, but that hearing was postponed because claimant had not yet received and reviewed the employer's offered exhibits. A telephone hearing was held on November 15, 2023. Claimant, Annette Spight, participated. Employer, Hy-Vee Inc., participated through Corporate Cost Control Hearing Representative Kathleen Travers, who did not testify, with testifying witnesses Store Manager Matt Eggers, Store Manager Trainee Sarah Perry, and District Store Director Brian Thomas. Employer's Exhibits 1, 5 through 14, 16 through 19, and 21 through 25 were admitted over a relevance objection by claimant. Employer's Exhibit 20 was admitted without objection. Employer's Exhibits 2 through 4 and 15 were not admitted due to relevance.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on March 25, 2016. Claimant last worked as a full-time customer service representative. Claimant was separated from employment on September 25, 2023, when she was discharged.

On September 25, 2023, claimant was working at the service desk. A customer forgot to give a \$1.00 to the cashier at the time of the checkout, so the customer was told to see the service desk to redeem the coupon. The customer approached claimant where a disagreement ensued. Claimant processed the transaction but did not give the customer the dollar. The customer asked for the dollar, and claimant said she had given the customer the dollar already. Eventually, claimant gave the customer the dollar but also asked for the customer's name and phone number because she intended to follow up with the customer if her drawer was short \$1.00 or if the drawer was not short. Claimant left the customer's name and number somewhere around the service desk, where it was moved by someone else and lost. Claimant

did not follow up with the customer. The customer then complained about the interaction with claimant.

When the employer met with claimant about this interaction, claimant maintained that she had done nothing wrong. However, the employer had reviewed the surveillance footage, which does not have audio, and felt it corroborated the customer's account of the interaction based on body language, hand gestures, and the overall length of the transaction. Because claimant had received a final warning that indicated any additional customer complaint would result in her discharge, the employer discharged claimant on September 25, 2023.

Claimant had received one previous disciplinary warning on July 30, 2023. The warning was issued as the result of an absence that day. However, the warning also stated that any future customer complaints would result in termination of claimant's employment. Claimant refused to sign the warning because she disagreed with it.

Claimant also participated in a discussion with managers on July 7, 2023, in which she was warned that any future customer complaints would result in the termination of her employment. That discussion was brought about when a customer complained because the customer felt claimant was rude at checkout, when she sighed in response to the customer's request, and then set two of the customer's items in a place where they were missed, and the customer left without them.

The employer noted there was a long history of discussing claimant's demeanor at work with her. However, prior to July 2023, it had not issued claimant disciplinary warnings during these discussions. The employer indicated it was trying to coach claimant and bring issues to her attention so that she could make any needed adjustments, rather than issuing discipline.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) and (d) provide:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

...

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "*misconduct*" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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 even 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

- (1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.
- (5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual is compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.
- (6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.
- (7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that results in missing work.
- (8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.
- (10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.
- (11) Failure to maintain any license, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.
- (12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.
- (13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.
- (14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy. The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee.

The employer has demonstrated that it had many informal conversations with claimant regarding her demeanor with customers and employees at work. It has also demonstrated that claimant was informed twice in July 2023 that any future verified customer complaints would result in the termination of her employment. Despite this, claimant engaged in an argumentative interaction with a customer over a \$1.00 coupon. Because claimant had been explicitly warned against engaging with customers in this manner, and because she had been explicitly warned that doing so would cause the end of her employment, the final incident constitutes disqualifying misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The October 10, 2023, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.



Alexis D. Rowe
Administrative Law Judge

November 17, 2023
Decision Dated and Mailed

ar/scn

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov**

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.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL 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.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or 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.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
En línea: eab.iowa.gov**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiriera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.