

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CHANTELLE A NINER**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-12884-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY  
CASEY'S GENERAL STORE**  
Employer

**OC: 12/27/09**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Leaving

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the September 7, 2010 (reference 08) decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on November 3, 2010. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Manager Diane Stephenson.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether claimant quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer or if she was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant most recently worked part time as a clerk from April 6, 2010 and was separated from employment on August 5, 2010. On July 30 claimant went into the store for her paycheck and told Stephenson she was excited because she was hired for a body shop job, which was in her area of interest. Her last day of work was July 31, 2010. Because she was scheduled for only one other non-closing shift in August and Stephenson had hired another person to close, claimant left her store key with clerk Angie on August 2 and told her to give the key to Stephenson, who found it sitting on her desk but did not inquire as to the reason why. Stephenson assumed it meant that claimant had quit but did not contact her to determine her intention, which was to continue working at Casey's while starting a part-time car repair job with Henderson's Auto Body Shop. Claimant had been scheduled to work on August 3, but because Stephenson overscheduled the shift, she called and left claimant a message that she would not need to work that night. She was not on the schedule for any other shifts in August.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant did not quit but was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

871 IAC 24.26(21) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(21) The claimant was compelled to resign when given the choice of resigning or being discharged. This shall not be considered a voluntary leaving.

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.

A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship accompanied by an overt act of carrying out that intention. *Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer*, 289 N.W.2d 608, 612 (Iowa 1980).

Claimant's expression of excitement about beginning work at another part-time job was not an indication of an intention to quit work. Many people work more than one job, especially if they are both part time. Because there was unclear communication between claimant and employer about the interpretation of both parties' statements about the status of the employment relationship; the issue must be resolved by an examination of witness credibility and burden of proof. Because most members of management are considerably more experienced in personnel issues and operate from a position of authority over a subordinate employee, it is reasonably implied that the ability to communicate clearly is extended to discussions about employment status. Because claimant reasonably left her key for the new closing employee to use and employer did not verify her intention and took her off the schedule, claimant's interpretation of the circumstances as a discharge was reasonable and the burden of proof falls to the employer.

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). 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. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa 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. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa 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 Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. Inasmuch as claimant simply advised employer she had another part-time job, which was not unreasonable given her limited hours at Casey's, employer has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant engaged in misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The September 7, 2010 (reference 08) decision is affirmed. Claimant did not quit but was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. If claimant is working part time while claiming benefits, she must report gross weekly wages earned for the week in which benefits are claimed.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css