

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

MARCIA B HICKS
1436 J ST SW
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52404

ANDERSON SERVICES
C/o CORPORATE COST CONTROL INC
PO BOX 740065
DALLAS TX 75374

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-05526-S2T
OC: 04/30/06 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (1)

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:

Marcia Hicks (claimant) appealed a representative's May 16, 2006 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Anderson Services (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on June 14, 2006. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Jeff Bell, Route Supervisor. The employer offered one exhibit which was marked for identification as Exhibit One. Exhibit One was received into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on April 19, 2004, as a full-time route sales person. The employer issued the claimant a written warning on July 16, 2004, for having her sister work with her in a store, exposing the employer to liability. On December 2, 2005, the claimant stocked T.V. Guides in a store without having the proper paperwork in place for the sale of the item. On March 13, 2006, the employer again gave the claimant a written warning for having someone help her work. The employer issued the claimant a written warning and an improvement plan on April 19, 2006. The claimant was not supposed to start stocking items unless she could complete the work. The claimant only stocked half of the store's items. The employer warned the claimant that further infractions could result in her termination from employment. The claimant felt she was warned for actions that she felt would help the employer.

On April 18, 2006, the claimant was stocking items at Walmart. A Walmart customer was complaining about the price of a crossword magazine. The claimant told her she would give her one free if she purchased one. The claimant tore the cover off the second magazine and the customer took two for the price of one. The claimant could have taken the cover and reported it to the employer so the magazine could have been accounted for. The cover was found by a Walmart employee in the trash in a backroom. Without the cover, Walmart would have been charged for the magazine by the employer. The employer suspended the claimant on April 26, 2006. It terminated the claimant on May 1, 2006.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons, the administrative law judge concludes she was.

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 establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Repeated failure to follow an employer's instructions in the performance of duties is misconduct. Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Company, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa App. 1990). An employer has a right to expect employees to conduct themselves in a certain manner. The claimant disregarded the employer's right by repeatedly failing to follow the employer's rules. She again and again exposed the employer to liability. The claimant's disregard of the employer's interests is misconduct. As such, she is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The representative's May 16, 2006 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

bas/kkf