

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

DIANNE L BREMSER
213 HOWARD ST
DOW CITY IA 51528

HY-VEE INC
c/o TALX UCM SERVICES INC
P O BOX 00283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

TALX UC EXPRESS
4100 HUBBELL # 78
DES MOINES IOWA 50317-4546

ROBERT BRINK, ATTORNEY AT LAW
P O BOX 308
40 N MAIN ST
DENISON IA 51442

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-03227-MT
OC: 02/22/04 R: 01
Claimant: Appellant (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated March 16, 2004, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on April 19, 2004. Claimant participated personally and was represented by Robert Brink, Attorney at Law with witnesses Jean Lance, Evelyn Kidd, Kim Plough, Dawn Jessen, and Joleen Schultz. Employer participated by David Williams, Hearing Representative, Talx UC Express with witnesses Aaron Garms, Manager Store Operations; Pat Howarth, Human Resource Coordinator Four; Kelly Murphy, Meat Specialist; Matt Steinkuehler, Assistant Manager; and Todd Tetmeyer, Store Director. Exhibits A, B, One and Two were admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on February 21, 2004.

Employer discharged claimant on February 21, 2004 because claimant shopped for groceries while on the clock. After claimant finished shopping for groceries but before paying for the items, she clocked out. There was only 12 minutes between the clock-out and check-out time. Claimant had been informed of the policy and that the consequences would be discharge.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this matter is whether 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning shopping while on company time. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant stole time from the employer. Claimant was shopping while on the clock. Claimant could not have shopped and traveled the entire distance in the store and checked out in the 12 minutes allotted. It is just not believable that claimant made her way through that many aisles and checked out in just 12 minutes. The testimony of employer's many witnesses seems more credible. It is hard to believe that employer could get so many witnesses to lie or coordinate their stories. The conclusion is that claimant shopped on the clock in violation of company policy. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated March 16, 2004, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

mdm\s