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

| BRETT M RAPIEN | : : : HEADING NUMBER: 00D 111 02766 |
|------------------------|---|
| Claimant, | : HEARING NUMBER: 09B-UI-02766 : |
| and | : EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD : DECISION |
| NUTRI-JECT SYSTEMS INC | : |
| | |

Employer.

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 ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board, one member concurring, 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.

| John A. Peno | |
|--------------|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

AMG/fnv

CONCURRING OPINION OF MONIQUE F. KUESTER:

I agree with my fellow board members that the administrative law judge's decision should be affirmed; however, I would comment that 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. The employer maintained that the clamant was discharged due to excessive internet usage. However, the employer failed to provide the claimant with a direct verbal or written warning. (Tr. 10, lines 15-22) As a secondary reason, the employer cited insufficient job performance, but the employer failed to effectively prove that assertion. (Tr. 11, lines 12-26) The court in Richers v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 479 N.W.2d 308 (Iowa 1991) held that inability or incapacity to perform well is not volitional and thus, cannot be deemed misconduct. And lastly, I am troubled by the fact that the claimant was never told why he was being discharged. From the employer's viewpoint, the claimant's actions may have violated company policy but the claimant's actions did not disqualify him under unemployment compensation law.

| AMG/fnv | Monique F. Kuester |
|--|--|
| A portion of the employer's appeal to the Employmen which was not contained in the administrative file and wijudge. While the appeal and additional evidence (docu Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the today's decision. | which was not submitted to the administrative law uments) were reviewed, the Employment Appeal |
| | John A. Peno |
| | Elizabeth L. Seiser |

Monique F. Kuester

AMG/fnv