

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**KATHRYN A OBERBROEKLING
2920 WALNUT CT
BETTENDORF IA 52722-4500**

**IOC SERVICES LLC
1641 POPPS FERRY RD B1
BILOXI MS 39532-2226**

**Appeal Number: 06A-UI-03940-JTT
OC: 03/12/06 R: 04
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

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.

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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant Kathryn Oberbroekling filed a timely appeal from the March 30, 2006, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on April 27, 2006. Claimant participated. The employer failed to respond to the hearing notice instructions to provide a telephone number for the hearing and did not participate.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Kathryn Oberbroekling was employed by IOC Services, doing business as Isle of Capris Casino in Bettendorf, as a full-time floor supervisor in the poker room from October 2003 until March 14, 2006, when Poker Room Manager Greg Mendoza discharged her.

The final incident that prompted the discharge occurred on March 11, 2006, when the dealer at the poker table failed to properly secure the \$500.00 bank of poker chips at the table. Ms. Oberbroekling had handed her keys to the dealer so that the dealer could secure the drawer. Ms. Oberbroekling observed the dealer lock the drawer. Neither Ms. Oberbroekling nor the dealer was aware that the back of the drawer lid was not properly hooked into the body of the drawer and that the drawer, therefore, was not properly secured. The unsecured drawer was detected at the end of the business day when a security employee checked all of the drawers in the room as part of a routine security check. At the time Mr. Mendoza discharged Ms. Oberbroekling, he told her that she was being discharged because she had violated policy by giving her keys to another person. However, it was standard operating procedure for the floor supervisors to hand the keys to the dealer at a table so that the dealer could secure the drawer at his or her table. In addition, Mr. Mendoza had, within a few days of Ms. Oberbroekling's discharge, requested that she give her keys to him so that he could use them. Mr. Mendoza left the casino boat with the keys and returned 15 minutes later.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The question is whether the evidence in the record establishes that Ms. Oberbroekling was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment. It does not.

Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

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 individual shall be disqualified for benefits 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.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

- a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being 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. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

The employer failed to appear for the hearing and, therefore, failed to present any evidence whatsoever to corroborate or substantiate the allegation of misconduct. The evidence in the record fails to establish carelessness, negligence or intentional conduct on the part of Ms. Oberbroekling. Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Ms. Oberbroekling was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, Ms. Oberbroekling is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to Ms. Oberbroekling.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's decision dated March 30, 2006, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

jt/kkf