

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**SHAUN S CASSADY**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-10412-MT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**MENARD INC**  
Employer

**OC: 10/12/08 R: 02  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated November 4, 2008, reference 02, a duplicate decision, which held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on November 20, 2008. Claimant participated personally with witness Nancy Cassady. Employer participated by Jason Kuiper, Store Counsel, and Mike Goode, Store Manager. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on May 3, 2008.

Claimant was discharged on May 4, 2008 by employer because claimant was absent from work May 3, 2008. Claimant was on a final warning. Claimant had four prior absences. Employer was unable to specify why claimant was absent and whether he properly reported the absences. Employer had suspended claimant for three days due to absenteeism. Claimant was on notice his job was in trouble due to absenteeism.

**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(8) provides:

(8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations, and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. The Iowa Supreme Court has opined that one unexcused absence is not misconduct even when it followed nine other excused absences and was in violation of a direct order. Sallis v. EAB, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that the absences must be both excessive and unexcused. The Iowa Supreme Court has held that excessive is more than one. While three is a reasonable interpretation of excessive based on current case law and Webster's Dictionary, the interpretation is best derived from the facts presented.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning absenteeism. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, fails to constitute misconduct because employer could not establish that the prior absences were unexcused. Iowa law requires that the last absence and one or two prior absences be for non excusable reasons. Here employer could not provide the reasons for the absences and therefore has not met the burden of proving excessive unexcused events. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated November 4, 2008, reference 02, is affirmed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements. This decision in reference 02 is a duplicate decision of reference 01 and is thereby moot. All pertinent issues have been resolved in appeal number 08A-UI-10411-MT.

---

Marlon Mormann  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/kjw