

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**ANGELA D REEVES**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-04182-MT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**FAMILY DOLLAR STORES OF IOWA INC  
STORE #1424**  
Employer

**OC: 03/25/07 R: 04  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated April 13, 2007, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on May 9, 2007. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Lorrie Park, District Manager.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on March 26, 2007.

Claimant was discharged on March 26, 2007 by employer because claimant violated multiple security policies. Claimant allowed night deposits of store receipts one day a week. The employer required deposits be made during daylight hours. Claimant also closed the store with one person instead of the two as required by policy. Claimant did not leave an unauthorized person in charge of the store. Employer could not provide specific dates of the infractions.

Claimant had no warnings on her record. Claimant did not know that her job was in jeopardy due to policy violations.

Employer was informed of these potential infractions on March 19, 2007 but did not discharge until March 26, 2007. Claimant was not suspended pending the investigation.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

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 fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning security issues. Claimant was not warned concerning these policies.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct because there is no current incident of misconduct. Claimant was allowed to work for over one week pending an investigation. This makes the prior acts stale. If the infractions were so serious to discharge, employer should have suspended claimant pending investigation. Furthermore, the lack of a warning detracts from a finding of carelessness or intentional conduct. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated April 13, 2007, reference 01, is reversed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

Marlon Mormann  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/kjw