

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

JUSTIN M MILLER

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 19A-UI-06186-JE-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

STELLAR MANAGEMENT GROUP V INC

Employer

OC: 07/07/19

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the August 5, 2019, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on August 27, 2019. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time sanitation worker for Stellar Management Group V from February 5, 2019 to July 11, 2019. He was discharged from employment due to a final incident of absenteeism that occurred on July 9, 2019.

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, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. The term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

The claimant was absent to care for his girlfriend and her mother. Immediate family is defined as a collective body of person who live under one roof and under one head or management, or a son or daughter, stepson, stepdaughter, father, mother, father-in-law, mother-in-law. Members of the immediate family must be related by blood or by marriage. The claimant accumulated approximately 30 absences during his five months of employment, none of which were to care for immediate family members or covered by FMLA. Thirty absences in five months is excessive. The claimant contends the employer said it would work with him. However, allowing 29 absences in a five-month period when he does not have vacation or sick leave to cover those absences is the epitome of working with him. The employer has the right to rely on the claimant showing up for work without accumulating excessive absences.

The claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of absenteeism, is considered excessive. Therefore, benefits must be denied.

DECISION:

The August 5, 2019, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/scn