

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**KATHLEEN ZEIMIS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-03341-SW**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CARE INITIATIVES**  
Employer

**OC: 01/23/11**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated March 11, 2011, reference 01, that concluded she was discharged for misconduct. A hearing was held on June 6, 2011, in Des Moines, Iowa. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing with her attorney, Laura Jontz. No one participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The claimant worked for the employer as a registered nurse from 2008 to January 26, 2011. She was discharged by the employer on January 26, 2011, because the employer alleged she was responsible for four narcotic pills being missing from a narcotics box that had been sent back to the pharmacy in early January 2011. The claimant did not do anything willfully or negligently to cause the narcotics box to be short the pills in question.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

The unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. The rules define misconduct as (1) deliberate acts or omissions by a worker that materially breach the duties and obligations arising out of the contract of employment, (2) deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of employees, or (3) carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent, or evil design. 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 misconduct within the meaning of the statute. 871 IAC 24.32(1).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. 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 substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

The employer has failed to meet its burden to show the claimant committed any willful and substantial misconduct or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated March 11, 2011, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if she is otherwise eligible.

---

Steven A. Wise  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

saw/kjw