

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CHELLY S STRAHMANN**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-06376-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**MARKETLINK INC**  
Employer

**OC: 03/21/10**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the April 26, 2010 (reference 02) decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on June 4, 2010. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Donna Jessen.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant most recently worked part-time as a telemarketer and was separated from employment on April 1, 2010. Her last day of work was on March 18, 2010 and she was suspended three days for attendance issues. She was not scheduled to work on March 24, 25, and 26 and provided medical notes for absences from March 9 through 15, March 23, March 29, 30, 31 and April 1, 2010 for herself and her young children who were not allowed to attend school or daycare if they had an elevated temperature or were vomiting. The final absence was related to her daughter's fever and pneumonia, which resulted in hospitalization.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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(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.

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness or injury cannot constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Absences related to lack of childcare are generally held to be unexcused. *Harlan v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 192 (Iowa 1984). However, a good faith inability to obtain childcare for a sick infant may be excused. *McCourtney v. Imprimis Technology, Inc.*, 465 N.W.2d 721 (Minn. App. 1991).

An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. In the case of an illness, it would seem reasonable that employer would not want an employee to report to work if they are at risk of infecting other employees or customers. Certainly, an employee who is ill or injured is not able to perform their job at peak levels. A reported absence related to illness or injury is excused for the purpose of the Iowa Employment Security Act. Because the final absence for which she was discharged was related to properly reported illness or injury, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism has been established and no disqualification is imposed.

#### **DECISION:**

The April 26, 2010 (reference 02) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs