

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**EUGENE BEAL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 06A-UI-09438-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**ECONOMY COATING SYSTEMS INC**  
Employer

**OC: 08/06/06 R: 04  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Eugene Beal (claimant) filed a timely appeal to an unemployment insurance decision dated August 29, 2006, reference 01, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from Economy Coating Systems, Inc. (employer) for work-related misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on October 9, 2006. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Dan Gee and Monica Piercy. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected 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 employed as a full-time water blast from October 31, 2005 through August 10, 2006, when he was discharged for attendance. Two written warnings for attendance were issued on February 14 and February 17, 2006. He reportedly had ten absences after that last written warning and was discharged after the eleventh incident. The final incident was due to illness and was properly reported.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

The claimant was discharged for excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism, a concept which includes tardiness, is misconduct. See Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. Id. The claimant had two warnings but was not discharged until after 11 more incidents. It is unclear how he would have known his job was in jeopardy. Furthermore, the final absence was due to illness and was properly reported. 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). Although the employer may require a doctor's note to excuse an absence due to illness, it is not a requirement of the unemployment insurance laws. Work-connected misconduct has not been established in this case and benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 29, 2006, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw