

Michael Thomas Harbuck
130 Anderson Road
Roxboro, NC 27573
michaelharbuck@gmail.com
(407)-408-3009
xxx-xx-1274: Claimant ID: 11073976

November 12, 2019

North Carolina Department of Commerce
Division of Employment Security
Unemployment Insurance

Dear Sir or Madame,

I have received the form letter informing me that my application for benefit started on 10/13/19 has been denied per N.C. Gen. Stat. Â§ 96-14.6(a) and (b).

This correspondence shall be my **official appeal** of the determination.

1. **Neither** willful or wanton disregard of the employer's interest as is found in deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior due to my **accidental** damage of company property,
2. **Nor** conduct evincing carelessness or negligence of such degree or recurrence as to manifest an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer **occured**.

Explanation:

Although property of my former employer was damaged due to my actions. these actions were an accident arising from the the non compliance, lack of work ethic and lackadaisical non-professional attitude of two co-workers which forced myself to perform duties in order to rectify and keep the interest of the employer, where the aforementioned co-workers had failed to perform their own duties.

Had the co-workers performed thier duties as per company policy, I myself would not have been forced into the position of performing said duties for these parties.

Basically, if the two guys had cleaned the shop as they should have done, I would not have had to do it for them, hence the situation would never have occurred at all.

As a professional and educated mechanic I take offense that working diligently and attempting to cover the responsibilities of others as well as go above and beyond my expected responsibilities has been used to deem my actions as negligent.

Furthermore:

Both verbalised and non verbalised grievances stood between myself and the management of BOYD OLDS-PONTIAC-BUICK-GMC.

Being that the same policies used to accuse me of negligence were contorted and inferred differently for different persons. For example:

1. the negligent destruction of customer property due to another employee's negligent work causing well above the damage of my accident.
2. as well as a two faced vacation policy favoring some employees over others whereby I voiced a question regarding denial of a vacation request for a certain amount of time which was refused, while others were allowed a longer interval not allowed by company policy, whereby I was not given explanation.

It is my belief that the **board of review** should reconsider the determination. No statement, or my point of view of the incident leading to my firing has been requested nor reviewed, so I ask how a fair determination can be made without it?

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael Thomas Harbuck