

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

VELORIA D SHIELDS

Claimant,

and

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 12B-UI-15463

**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 DENIED

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. Two members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. Those members are not in agreement. Monique F. Kuester would affirm and John A. Peno would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge.

Since there is not agreement, the decision of the administrative law judge is affirmed by operation of law. The Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law of the administrative law judge are adopted by the Board and that decision is **AFFIRMED** by operation of law. See, 486 IAC 3.3(3).

Monique F. Kuester

DISSENTING OPINION OF JOHN A. PENO:

I respectfully dissent from the decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge. The Claimant was discharged on November 7, 2011 for a final infraction that occurred almost two weeks prior on October 26, 2011. The record establishes that the Claimant was fired after the Claimant made a complaint to the Employer about disparate treatment. (Tr. 29, lines 19-29) The Claimant had no further violations after October 26th. The court in Greene v. Employment Appeal Board, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa App. 1988) held that in order to determine whether conduct prompting the discharged constituted a “current act,” the date on which the conduct came to the Employer’s attention and the date on which the Employer notified the Claimant that said conduct subjected the Claimant to possible termination must be considered to determine if the termination is disqualifying. Any delay in timing from the final act to the actual termination must have a reasonable basis.

While the Employer may have compelling business reasons to terminate the Claimant, conduct that might warrant a discharge from employment will not necessarily sustain a disqualification from job insurance benefits. Budding v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 337 N.W.2d 219 (Iowa App. 1983).

John A. Peno

A portion of the Employer’s appeal to the Employment Appeal Board consisted of additional evidence which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the appeal and additional evidence were reviewed, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today’s decision.

John A. Peno

Monique F. Kuester

AMG/fnv