

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

CHRISTINE M PURDY

Claimant,

and

BOSTON WINDOW CLEANING INC

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 14B-UI-03633

**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, 96.3-7

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Claimant 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**.

Kim D. Schmett

Cloyd (Robby) Robinson

DISSENTING OPINION OF ASHLEY R. KOOPMANS:

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's remark was *not* threatening, nor was it intended to be a threat. It appears that she was disciplined for an act committed by someone else (daughter). For this reason, I would conclude that the Employer failed to satisfy their burden of proof and would allow benefits.

Ashley R. Koopmans

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.

The Claimant has requested this matter be remanded for a new hearing. The Employment Appeal Board finds the applicant did not follow the instructions on the notice of hearing. Therefore, good cause has not been established to remand this matter. The remand request is **DENIED**.

Kim D. Schmett

Cloyd (Robby) Robinson

Ashley R. Koopmans

AMG/fnv