

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

SHEILA A HOFFMAN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-06762-MT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HY-VEE INC
Employer

OC: 05/12/13
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated May 28, 2013, reference 01, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on July 11, 2013. Claimant participated personally with witness Carol Ruden. Employer participated by Pamela Kiel, Haring Representative Corporate Cost Control with witness Peter Streit, Store Director. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

ISSUES:

The issues in this matter are whether claimant was discharged for misconduct and is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for the employer April 29, 2013.

Employer discharged claimant on April 29, 2013 because claimant allegedly tipped off pharmacy workers that they were being investigated. Claimant made an offhand comment about being watched in a conversation about buying pop at the café. Claimant did not tip anyone off about a pharmacy investigation. Employer had warned claimant on two different occasions about her workplace behavior.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

871 IAC 24.32(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and the 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 cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

The administrative law judge holds that the evidence has failed to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated the employer's policy concerning impeding investigations. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge fails to constitute misconduct because employer failed to prove that the comment about being watched had anything to do with the pharmacy investigation. Employer has failed in its burden of proof. Therefore, claimant was not

discharged for an act of misconduct and as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated May 28, 2013, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible. The claimant is not overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/css