

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

ANDREW B FINN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-14020-HT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

UFP TECHNOLOGIES INC
Employer

OC: 10/28/12
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)

Section 96.5(2)a – Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, UFP Technologies, Inc. (UFP), filed an appeal from a decision dated November 21, 2012, reference 01. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Andrew Finn. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on December 31, 2012. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where he could be contacted and did not participate. The employer participated by Human Resources Representative Stephanie Wiese and was represented by UTMC in the person of Kevin Reilly..

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Andrew Finn was employed by UFP from October 10, 2011 until October 19, 2012 as a full-time pulper. He received the employee handbook at the time of hire and it contains the attendance and progressive disciplinary policies.

Mr. Finn received a counseling December 15, 2011, for absenteeism, and written warnings on March 28, April 20 and June 6, 2012, for the same problem. A final warning and one-day suspension on August 31, 2012, notified him his job was in jeopardy if there were any further incidents.

Mr. Finn was no-call/no-show to work for two consecutive shifts on October 16 and 19, 2012. The employer had no contact from him until the next week when he returned to pick up his check. Human Resources Representative Stephanie Wiese gave him his check and asked why he had not been at work. He said he had “personal problems” and knew his job was in jeopardy so did not come in for the next shift. When questioned he assured Ms. Wiese the problems were not work related but “personal.”

Andrew Finn has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of October 28, 2012.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

871 IAC 24.32(7) provides:

(7) Excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism is an intentional disregard of the duty owed by the claimant to the employer and shall be considered misconduct except for illness or other reasonable grounds for which the employee was absent and that were properly reported to the employer.

The claimant had been advised his job was in jeopardy as a result of his absenteeism. The final occurrence was a no-call/no-show due to personal problems. Any absence, even if it is due to illness, must be properly reported in order to be excused. *Cosper v. IDJS*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Absences due to personal problems are not considered an excused absence. *Harlan v. IDJS*, 350 N.W.2d 192 (Iowa 1984).

The record establishes the claimant was discharged for excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Under the provisions of the above Administrative Code section, this is misconduct and the claimant is disqualified.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits to which he is not entitled. The question of whether the claimant must repay these benefits is remanded to the UIS division.

DECISION:

The representative's decision of November 21, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. Andrew Finn is disqualified and benefits are withheld until he has earned ten times his weekly benefit amount in insured work, provided he is otherwise eligible. The issue of whether the claimant must repay the unemployment benefits is remanded to UIS division for determination.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/css