

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

LAURA CALDERON  
401 WOODLAND ST  
MARSHALLTOWN IA 50158

SWIFT & CO  
c/o EMPLOYERS UNITY INC  
P O BOX 749000  
ARVADA CO 80006-9000

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-01052-SWT  
OC: 01/02/05 R: 02  
Claimant: Appellant (1)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated January 21, 2005, reference 01, that concluded she was discharged for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on February 15, 2005. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing with the assistance of interpreter, Rosa Maria Paramo-Ricoy. Chris Lamb participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as a laborer from January 16, 2001, to December 20, 2004. The claimant was informed and understood that under the employer's work rules, regular attendance was required and employees were required to notify the employer if they were not able to work as scheduled. The work rules provide that employees receive points for unscheduled absences and tardiness and are subject to discharged after receiving ten points in a twelve-month period.

The claimant received ten points after being absent from work without notice to the employer on November 16, 2004. She had previously been warned that she was at nine points on November 2 because was absent from work without proper notice on October 30.

The employer could have discharged the claimant after her absence on November 16, 2004, but instead she was placed on last chance agreement on November 19, 2004, that provided that she would be discharged if she were late or absent again in the next 90 days.

The claimant was more than six minutes late on December 20, 2004. The claimant did not punch in to work as she was required to do, but her supervisor observed her reporting to work after her scheduled start time. She claimed that she had reported to work on time but was late in getting to the line by no more than a couple of minutes because she was in the bathroom sick due to being pregnant. This claim is not credible.

The employer discharged the claimant on December 20, 2004, for excessive unexcused absenteeism.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

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's excessive unexcused absenteeism was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated January 21, 2005, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits until she has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

saw/s