

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TRISTAL ERICKSON
Claimant

KWIK TRIP INC
Employer

APPEAL 23A-UI-11615-CS-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 10/29/23
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code §96.5(2)a-Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On December 12, 2023, the employer/appellant filed an appeal from the December 4, 2023, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on claimant being dismissed on October 30, 2023. The Iowa Workforce Development representative determined there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. The representative determined the leaving was caused by employer. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 3, 2024. Claimant did not call in to participate. Employer participated through Store Leader, Tom Wagner. Employer's exhibit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were admitted into the record. Administrative notice was taken of claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records.

ISSUES:

- I. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?
- II. Should claimant repay benefits?
- III. Should the employer be charged due to employer participation in fact finding?
- IV. Is the claimant overpaid benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on July 13, 2018. Claimant last worked as a full-time Food Service Leader. Claimant managed the kitchen and was responsible for training team members on the employer's food handling policies. Claimant was separated from employment on October 30, 2023, when she was discharged.

The employer has a code of conduct policy that in relevant part states:

“Other inappropriate behavior which will result in disciplinary action up to, and including termination, include, but are not limited to:

10. Inefficient performance of duties, incompetence, neglect of duty, loafing or horseplay.” (Exhibit 5).

The employer also has a Food Service Sanitation Policy that in relevant part states:

- “Wash hands at the right times using proper hand washing techniques.” (Exhibit 6).
- “Coworkers must wear a disposable uniform when handling raw chicken and during cleanup of raw materials. This uniform consists of disposable yellow gloves, plastic arm sleeves and plastic aprons. Immediately discard after use and wash hands.” (Exhibit 6).

The employer requires hand washing “after handling raw meat and major allergens.” (Exhibit 6). The employer requires the employees to insert a probe into their previously raw chicken products and ensure they have reached the proper 165-degree temperature before they are served to customers. Claimant was aware of these policies and trained employees on the employer’s policies and processes. (Exhibit 3 & 4).

On October 20, 2023, and October 21, 2023, claimant was observed on camera failing to properly inserting a temperature probe into product. Claimant did not ensure the products reached proper temperature before serving to customers. The employer observed the claimant on camera multiple times throughout the two days fail to take the internal temperature before serving to customers.

Additionally, claimant did not follow the proper hand washing technique after handling raw products. The employer requires employees to use a special apron when preparing raw products and using gloves. When they are done handling the raw product they are required to remove the apron, remove their gloves and wash their hands. After washing their hands they are required to put on a new pair of gloves. Claimant was observed taking off the gloves she used in the preparation of the raw products and failing to wash her hands before she put on a new pair of gloves to handle the cooked product.

The employer discharged claimant for violating their code of conduct and their food service sanitation policy on October 30, 2023. Claimant did not have a previous warning for violating these policies.

Claimant filed for benefits with an effective date of October 29, 2023. Claimant has not filed for any weekly benefits and has not received any benefits.

The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview. The employer did not present evidence establishing a reason for their failure to participate.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a and d provide:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "*misconduct*" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

- (1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.
- (5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual is compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.
- (6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.
- (7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that result in missing work.
- (8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.
- (10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.

(11) Failure to maintain any licenses, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.

(12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.

(13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

(14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). "Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of benefits." *Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy. The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dept of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee.


In this case claimant was in a leadership position and was aware of the employer's policies. Claimant was responsible for training employees on the policies and the employer's processes. The failure to obtain the internal temperature of the chicken before it was served to customers was not an isolated event. The employer observed claimant fail to obtain the temperature throughout the day over the course of two days. Claimant's conduct in failing to properly ensure the product met the required 165-degree exposed the employer to legal liability if customers got sick and/or sanctions for violating the health and safety law. Accordingly, benefits are denied.

Since claimant has not received benefits claimant has not been overpaid benefits and the employer's lack of participation in the fact-finding interview are moot.

DECISION:

The December 4, 2023, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is REVERSED. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Claimant has not filed for benefits. As a result, claimant has not been overpaid benefits. The employer's participation in the fact-finding interview is moot since claimant has not received benefits.

A rectangular box containing a handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carly Smith".

Carly Smith
Administrative Law Judge

January 8, 2024
Decision Dated and Mailed

rvs

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov**

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.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL 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.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Note to Parties: YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or 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.

Note to Claimant: It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100
Des Moines, Iowa 50321
Fax: (515)281-7191
En línea: eab.iowa.gov**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

Nota para las partes: USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

Nota para el reclamante: es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.