

**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**

**SHARON E HICKENBOTTOM
1905 N OHIO AVE
DAVENPORT IA 52804**

**AMERICAN TV & APPLIANCE INC
2404 W BELTLINE HWY
MADISON WI 53713**

**Appeal Number: 06A-UI-01085-DT
OC: 12/18/05 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:

Sharon E. Hickenbottom (claimant) appealed a representative's January 18, 2006 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from American TV & Appliance, Inc. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on February 16, 2006. The claimant participated in the hearing. Mike Kapets appeared on the employer's behalf and presented testimony from two other witnesses, Steve Grappe and Ann Jackson. 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 November 5, 1998. She worked full time as a sales professional at the employer's Davenport, Iowa, store. Her last day of work was December 17, 2005. The employer discharged her on that date. The stated reason for the discharge was improper conduct toward a manager.

On December 15, 2005, the claimant was working a 9:45 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. shift. At approximately 8:00 p.m., she approached the manager on duty, Mr. Grappe, and asked if she could leave early, because it was snowing and she would need to shovel at home. He asked her if she had sufficient sales performance under a formula that gave the employees points toward leaving early if their performance was high enough, and she responded that she did not. Mr. Grappe therefore denied her request.

The claimant became upset, began crying, and made negative statements about her own sales manager, who had set up the sales performance formula. She commented that the formula, which had the result in her not being able to leave early, was "g - - - d - - - f - - - ing b - - - s - - -."

Mr. Grappe reported the incident to the general manager, Mr. Kapets, and to human resources, the following day, and the employer determined to discharge the claimant. The employer also took into consideration that the claimant had been given prior disciplinary action for other types of issues, and that she had been given two suspension steps, one on October 8, 2005, and the second on November 2, 2005, when normally there is only one suspension disciplinary step.

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 §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 claimant asserted that the reason she gave Mr. Grappe for wanting to go home was that she was sick, not to shovel snow. The administrative law judge finds Mr. Grappe's testimony that the claimant did not mention anything about feeling ill to be more credible. The claimant's behavior upon having her request denied 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 January 18, 2006 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The employer discharged the claimant for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as of December 17, 2005. 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/kjw