

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

CHRIS HEINE
Claimant

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

APPEAL 18A-UI-00225-LJ-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 12/10/17
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the December 29, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon a determination that claimant was discharged and the employer failed to prove willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 29, 2018. The claimant, Chris Heine, did not register a telephone number at which to be reached and did not participate in the hearing. The employer, Swift Pork Company, participated through Chelsea Cornelius, Human Resources Manager. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 12 were received and admitted into the record.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time, most recently as a production employee, from September 1, 2016, until December 7, 2017, when he was discharged for absenteeism. Claimant's final absence that was considered by the employer in making the decision to discharge him occurred on November 24, 2017. Claimant called in that day and requested FMLA leave. According to the employer, claimant was not eligible for FMLA leave at the time. Claimant was absent and late to work on multiple days following this absence. However, Cornelius testified that the November 24 absence was the final absence that counted against him. Claimant was warned on multiple occasions for his attendance, and he was aware that his job was in jeopardy.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$910.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of December 10, 2017, for the three weeks ending December 30, 2017. The administrative record also establishes that the

employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview or provide written documentation that, without rebuttal, would have resulted in disqualification.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute work-connected misconduct since they are not volitional, even if the employer was fully within its rights to assess points or impose discipline up to or including discharge for the absence under its attendance policy. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 6; *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 734 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007). Medical documentation is not essential to a determination that an absence due to illness should be treated as excused. *Gaborit*, 734 N.W.2d at 554. 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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) (emphasis added); see *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (Iowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law."

The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins* at 192. Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper* at 10. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds," *Higgins* at 191,

or because it was not “properly reported,” holding excused absences are those “with appropriate notice.” *Cosper* at 10.

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, supra*. However, a good faith inability to obtain childcare for a sick infant may be excused. *McCourtney v. Imprimis Tech., Inc.*, 465 N.W.2d 721 (Minn. Ct. App. 1991). See *Gimbel v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 489 N.W.2d 36 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992) where a claimant’s late call to the employer was justified because the claimant, who was suffering from an asthma attack, was physically unable to call the employer until the condition sufficiently improved; and *Roberts v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 356 N.W.2d 218 (Iowa 1984) where unreported absences are not misconduct if the failure to report is caused by mental incapacity. An employer’s no-fault absenteeism policy or point system is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits. A properly reported absence related to illness or injury is excused for the purpose of Iowa Employment Security Law because it is not volitional.

In this case, claimant requested FMLA to cover his final absence. The administrative law judge interprets this as claimant calling in due to illness or injury. The employer has not established that claimant had excessive absences which would be considered unexcused for purposes of unemployment insurance eligibility. Because claimant’s last absence was related to properly reported illness or other reasonable grounds, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism occurred which establishes work-connected misconduct. Since the employer has not established a current or final act of misconduct, the history of other incidents need not be examined. Accordingly, benefits are allowed. As claimant’s separation from employment is not disqualifying, the issues of overpayment, repayment, and chargeability are moot.

DECISION:

The December 29, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible. The issues of overpayment, repayment, and chargeability are moot.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/scn