

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

ANN M BRUMBACK

Claimant,

and

HY-VEE INC

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 14B-UI-05738

**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, one member dissenting, reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board 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

John M. Priester

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 was hired as a pharmacy technician for which she was required to pass the certification examination after working one year – a state law requirement to remain licensed. Her failure to comply with that requirement placed her job in jeopardy, which she knew at the time of her hire. Based on this record, I would conclude that benefits should be denied 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 Claimant submitted a written argument to the Employment Appeal Board. The Employment Appeal Board reviewed the argument. A portion of the argument consisted of additional evidence which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the argument and additional evidence were considered, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision.

Kim D. Schmett

John M. Priester

Ashley R. Koopmans

AMG/fnv