

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ERIK L CRIPPS**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-06555-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**BURKE MARKETING CORPORATION**

Employer

**OC: 06/15/08 R: 02  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the July 14, 2008, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on July 30, 2008. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Shelli Seibert, Human Resources Generalist. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the 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 that: The claimant was hired on October 9, 2006, as a full-time sanitation laborer. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on July 18, 2007. The claimant was absent from work due to illness frequently because he used hot water in a cold climate. The employer issued the claimant warnings for absenteeism on June 6, July 11, 25, October 15, and December 21, 2007. The claimant was absent due to illness on June 18, 2008. He properly reported the illness to the employer. The employer terminated the claimant on June 19, 2008.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for misconduct.

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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Excessive absences are not misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The employer must establish not only misconduct, but that there was a final incident of misconduct which precipitated the discharge. The last incident of absence was a properly reported illness that occurred on June 18, 2008. The claimant's absence does not amount to job misconduct, because it was properly reported. The employer has failed to provide any evidence of willful and deliberate misconduct that was the final incident leading to the discharge. The claimant was discharged, but there was no misconduct.

#### **DECISION:**

The July 14, 2008, reference 01, representative's decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw