

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

SUSAN E GRIGLIONE

Claimant

and

RIVERSIDE CASINO & GOLF RESORT

Employer

HEARING NUMBER: 17BUI-07084

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-A

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. With the following modification, the administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED** with the following **MODIFICATION**:

The Employment Appeal Board would modify the administrative law judge's Reasoning and Conclusions of Law to include the following as supportive legal analysis:

The Claimant's repeated inaccuracies after numerous disciplinary actions demonstrated "...carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent...[showing] an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer." See, 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a).

We have quoted the rule on misconduct, and this rule provides that repeated negligence can be disqualifying. We conclude here that the Employer has proven a pattern of carelessness by the Claimant of such a degree of recurrence as to constitute misconduct under rule 24.32(1)(a). Specifically, we conclude that the employer has proven a pattern of carelessness by the Claimant that is of "equal culpability" to a "deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees." "Culpability" is defined by Black's Law Dictionary to mean "blameworthiness." See also *Webster's Third International Dictionary, Unabridged*, (1961)(giving "blameworthiness" for definition of culpability). Black's goes on to provide that even in criminal cases "culpability requires a showing that the person acted purposely, knowingly, *recklessly*, or *negligently* with respect to each material element..." The word "culpable" is defined in Black's to mean "1. Guilty; *blameworthy* 2. *Involving the breach of a duty*." Webster's massive unabridged dictionary notes that the stronger sense of "culpable" meaning "criminal" is in fact "obsolete." Instead for modern definitions of "culpable" the 3rd unabridged gives "meriting condemnation or censure esp. as criminal <~ plotters> <~ homicides> or *as conducive to accident*, loss, or disaster <~ *negligence*>." *Webster's Third International Dictionary, Unabridged*, (1961)(emphasis added). Applying the standards of rule 24.32(1)(a) governing **repeated** carelessness we find that the claimant's pattern of carelessness proven on this record demonstrates negligence of such a **degree of recurrence** as to constitute culpable negligence that is as equally culpable as intentional misconduct.

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

AMG/fnv

DATED AND MAILED: _____