

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LYNDA J WILLIAMS
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-12088-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS CORP
Employer

OC: 08-14-11
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the September 12, 2011, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 7, 2011. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Ben Wise, Hiring Supervisor.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged due to job related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a production worker full time beginning July 12, 2010 through August 19, 2011 when she was discharged. The claimant was discharged for excessive absenteeism after she missed work from July 5 through July 11 when her son was hospitalized with a respiratory infection. When she returned to work on July 14 she was given Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) paperwork to have her physician complete and return to the employer. The claimant turned the paperwork into physician Deepak Jajoo. Neither the physician nor the hospital ever completed the paperwork and returned it to the employer. The claimant returned to work on July 14 and with the exception of four days of vacation from August 1 through August 5 she worked until her discharge on August 19.

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 § 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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. 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). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). 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. A reported absence related to illness or injury is excused for the purpose of the Iowa Employment Security Act. An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits. The claimant needed to be with her ill child who was hospitalized. She had no way to force the physician to complete the FMLA paperwork. 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 September 12, 2011 (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs