

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

DIXIE D MORTON

Claimant,

and

THOMBERT INC

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 14B-UI-11371

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

N O T I C E

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

D E C I S I O N

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

James M. Strohman

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. The Employer failed to provide any firsthand witnesses to refute the Claimant's firsthand testimony. Thus, I would attribute more weight to the Claimant's testimony that she did not take the paint or the acetone. She only took the box, which employees were allowed to take from surplus. Based on this record, I would conclude that the Employer failed to satisfy their burden of proof. Benefits should be allowed provided the Claimant is otherwise eligible.

Ashley R. Koopmans

The Employer 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.

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

AMG/ss

DATED: _____