

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SETH A ROBERTSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-17872-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HY-VEE INC
Employer

**Original Claim: 11/01/09
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Seth Robertson (claimant) appealed a representative's November 20, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Hy-Vee (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for January 8, 2010. The claimant participated personally. The employer was represented by Judith Schulte, Attorney at Law, and participated by Randy Menke, Store Director. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on September 5, 2006, as a full-time overnight shift manager. The claimant signed he had read the employer's handbook on September 5, 2006. The handbook contains a policy that prohibits an employee from checking out immediate family members, friends, or themselves.

The claimant received Women, Infant and Children (WIC) monies to pay for his child's formula. The child did not like the formula listed on the WIC check. In October 2009, the claimant asked the store director if he could exchange the formula purchased with the WIC check. The store director told the claimant that exchange for a formula not listed on the WIC check was not allowed.

On October 31, 2009, the claimant attempted to return WIC formula for another formula. The cashier called the front end manager to the register. The front end manager told the claimant he was not allowed to exchange the formula because it was purchased through a WIC transaction.

On November 1, 2009, the claimant went to a register, returned the WIC formula and rang up the purchase of the other formula. The employer terminated the claimant on November 1, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to follow instructions in the performance of the job. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to follow the employer's instructions. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, the claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's November 20, 2009 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw