

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

TEMEKA L SMITH

Claimant

and

BETTENDORF HEALTHCARE MGMT

Employer

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 16B-UI-10384

**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 ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board, one member dissenting, finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. 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**.

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

DISSENTING OPINION OF KIM D. SCHMETT:

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the administrative law judge's decision. I would find that the Claimant admitted calling the office manager a 'b-tch,' which is unacceptable behavior particularly in the presence of co-workers and a resident. For this reason, I would deny benefits until such time she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. See, Iowa Code section 96.5(2)"a".

Kim D. Schmett

The Employer submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by the Employer was not presented at hearing. Accordingly all the new and additional information submitted has not been relied upon in making our decision, and has received no weight whatsoever, but rather has been wholly disregarded.

The Employer has requested this matter be remanded for a new hearing. The Employment Appeal Board finds the applicant did not follow the instructions on the notice of hearing. Therefore, good cause has not been established to remand this matter. The remand request is **DENIED**.

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman