# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**CHAD M MCALLISTER** 

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 07A-UI-04910-LT** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

**DECISION** 

**DONOHOO STEEL TREATING CO** 

Employer

OC: 04/15/07 R: 04 Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct Iowa Code § 96.5(1)d – Voluntary Leaving/Illness or Injury

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the May 11, 2007, reference 03, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on June 20, 2007. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Bill Donohoo and Jim Clausen.

#### ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer or if he was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full time furnace helper from January 10, 2005 until March 31, 2007 when he was discharged. He had been off work since December 15, 2006 when he was hospitalized for about two weeks for a non-work-related illness. The doctor did not want him returning to work since there were side effects from the medication so he ended up back in the hospital in March for another three weeks. His physician released him to return to work on or about April 15, 2007 without medications or restrictions. At that point claimant was unsure if he still had a job so his brother called and was told he had been separated.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason.

# Iowa Code § 96.5-1 provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

### 871 IAC 24.26(6)b provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

- (6) Separation because of illness, injury or pregnancy.
- b. Employment related separation. The claimant was compelled to leave employment because of an illness, injury, or allergy condition that was attributable to the employment. Factors and circumstances directly connected with employment which caused or aggravated the illness, injury, allergy, or disease to the employee which made it impossible for the employee to continue in employment because of serious danger to the employee's health may be held to be an involuntary termination of employment and constitute good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant will be eligible for benefits if compelled to leave employment as a result of an injury suffered on the job.

In order to be eligible under this paragraph "b" an individual must present competent evidence showing adequate health reasons to justify termination; before quitting have informed the employer of the work-related health problem and inform the employer that the individual intends to quit unless the problem is corrected or the individual is reasonably accommodated. Reasonable accommodation includes other comparable work which is not injurious to the claimant's health and for which the claimant must remain available.

lowa Code § 96.5(1)(d) does not require a claimant to return to the employer to offer services after a medical recovery or release if the employment has already been terminated. *Porazil v. IWD*, No. 3-408 (lowa Ct. App. Aug. 27, 2003). The claimant was not required to return to the employer to offer services after the medical recovery because he had already been involuntarily terminated from his employment. Thus, the separation was a discharge.

# Iowa Code § 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.

## Iowa Code § 96.5-1-d provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

- 1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:
- d. The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Claimant had not yet been medically released to return to work as of the date of separation. No misconduct has been established. Benefits are allowed.

# **DECISION:**

The May 11, 2007,	reference 03,	decision is	affirmed.	The	claimant	was	discharged	for	no
disqualifying reason.	Benefits are	allowed, pro	vided the	claima	nt is othe	rwise	eligible.		

\_,----

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs