

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

RACHEL E GLESS
2207 N HOWELL ST
DAVENPORT IA 52804

HY-VEE INC
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

HY-VEE INC
c/o TALX UCM SERVICES INC
4100 HUBBELL AVE, #78
DES MOINES, IA 50317-4546

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-06872-DT
OC: 05/30/04 R: 04
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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Rachel E. Gless (claimant) appealed a representative's June 16, 2004 decision (reference 04) that concluded she was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from Hy-Vee, Inc. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on August 10, 2004. The claimant participated in the hearing. David Williams of TALX UC Express appeared on the employer's behalf and presented testimony from two witnesses, Scott James and Paul Shook. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on October 21, 2003. She worked part-time (approximately 20 hours per week) as a pay station clerk in the food court at the employer's Davenport, Iowa store. Her last day of work was May 7, 2004. The employer discharged her on that date. The stated reason for the discharge was inappropriate conduct.

On May 4, 2004, the claimant was on duty and had a discussion with her supervisor, Mr. Shook, the kitchen manager, regarding potential wage increases. Shortly after that discussion, the claimant began complaining loudly regarding the wages. Within approximately ten feet of a customer, the claimant commented that the "pay sucks." When she failed to settle down after Mr. Shook told her to quiet down, he told her to go ahead and leave for the day. She went and punched out, then returned to the area and continued to complain loudly and angrily about the pay. Mr. Shook again told the claimant to leave, telling her she could speak to the store director, Mr. James, when she returned to work. She ultimately did leave the store.

Mr. Shook reported the incident to Mr. James, and when the claimant returned to work on May 7, Mr. James met with the claimant. Mr. James attempted to discuss the incident with the claimant and attempted to determine if there were options that would pacify the claimant's concerns. The claimant responded in the same fashion as she had with Mr. Shook, stating that the "pay sucks," that the work was too hard for the pay, and that she could do a better job as store director than Mr. James. When Mr. James discerned that the claimant had no remorse for her conduct on May 4, but was rather continuing the same conduct, he discharged her.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the employer discharged the claimant for reasons establishing work-connected misconduct. The issue is not whether the employer was right or even had any other choice but to terminate the claimant's employment, 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 is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code Section 96.5-2-a. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982); Iowa Code Section 96.5-2-a.

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).

The employer provided credible and consistent testimony from two first-hand witnesses that the claimant had exhibited a belligerent attitude both within customers' hearing and to two supervisors. The claimant's conduct shows a willful or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer discharged the claimant for reasons amounting to work-connected misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's June 16, 2004 decision (reference 04) is affirmed. The employer discharged the claimant for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as of May 7, 2004. This disqualification continues until the claimant has been paid ten times her weekly benefit amount for insured work, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account will not be charged.

ld/smc