

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

SARA L LAFRATTE
421 EAST 16TH ST APT 1
DES MOINES IA 50316

MARKETLINK INC
ATTN CARLA PEARSON
4305 FLEUR DR
DES MOINES IA 50321

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-05554-SWT
OC: 04/24/05 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, 4th 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 May 13, 2005, reference 01, that concluded she was discharged for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on June 13, 2005. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. Margaret Ussery participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with a witness, Carla Pearson. Exhibits One through Six were admitted into evidence at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as a communication specialist from February 17, 2003, to April 26, 2005. 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 claimant was counseled regarding tardiness on January 11 and March 29, 2005. She received a written warning on April 5, 2005, after being late for work several times from March 1 to April 4. She was informed that she was required to be logged into her system at her scheduled start time and would be terminated for one more tardy.

On April 26, 2005, the claimant had problems with her electricity being turned off that she had to straighten out. As a result, the claimant logged into her system approximately 15 minutes late. The claimant did not call in to get permission to report to work late. Based on the prior warning, the claimant was discharged for repeated tardiness on April 26.

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).

The claimant's violation of the warning she had received 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. The evidence does not established that her reason for reporting to work late was an unavoidable emergency situation. She was repeatedly late despite warnings, often for substantial periods of time. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated May 13, 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/pjs