

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CORAL F LENTZKOW**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-00196-M2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WAL-MART STORES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 11/28/10**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated December 29, 2010, reference 03, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on February 15, 2011. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Aaron Bickel.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was discharged on December 1, 2010 by employer because she inadvertently paid a customer twice on the same check on November 11, 2010. The employer indicated that there was no evidence that the incident was anything other than a mistake, and that the incident in and of itself would not have resulted in a discharge without some previous unrelated attendance issues.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code § 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 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.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct. The claimant made an inadvertent mistake in the course of her employment. The act was not a deliberate act or omission, only an effort to provide customer service when claimant did not believe that the first payment to the customer had been completed.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated December 29, 2010, reference 03, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

Stan McElderry  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

srm/pjs