

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

**DUDLEY L ALLISON**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-04606-S1-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**VONACHEN SERVICES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 03/22/15**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Vonachen Services (employer) appealed a representative's April 9, 2015 (reference 01) decision that concluded Dudley Allison (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for May 26, 2015. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and, therefore, did not participate. The employer was represented by Stuart Larimer, Hearings Representative, and participated by Michael Franklin, Facility Worker. The employer offered and Exhibit One was received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on May 14, 2014; as a full-time mixer/duster. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on November 13, 2014. An employee must notify the employer of any absence by calling the supervisor at least two hours in advance of the start of the shift. The employer informed workers that their absences would be erased if they supplied a doctor's note for their absence.

On January 22, 2015, the claimant told the employer he would not be in for his scheduled shift because he was sick. The claimant did not provide a doctor's note or report his absence properly. The employer issued the claimant a warning on January 26, 2015. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On January 30, 2015, the claimant notified his supervisor he would be late for work because of transportation issues. He did not appear for work. On January 31, 2015, the claimant did not appear for work. His supervisor called the claimant and discovered he was sick. On February 2, 2015, the employer issued the claimant warnings for January 30 and 31, 2015. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On February 14, 2015, the claimant notified the employer he could not continue to work due to asthma issues. On February 16, 2015, the employer issued him a warning for his absence. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On March 19, 2015, the claimant was supposed to start his shift at 7:00 a.m. The claimant sent a text to his supervisor at 6:30 a.m.; notifying him he had a doctor's appointment and would not be at work. The claimant later called the supervisor to give the correct time of the doctor's appointment. At about noon the claimant sent a text saying he was on his way to work but he never appeared for work. The claimant was next scheduled to work on March 23, 2015. On March 23, 2015, the claimant did not bring a doctor's note to the employer excusing his absence on March 19, 2015. The employer terminated the claimant on March 23, 2015.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of March 22, 2015. He received \$1184 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer participated personally at the fact-finding interview on April 7, 2015, by Matthew Rodine.

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

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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(1)a, (8) provide:

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 Dep't of Job Serv., 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

(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 an improperly reported medical issue which occurred on March 19, 2015. The claimant's absence does amount to job misconduct because it was not properly reported. The claimant was discharged for misconduct. He is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code § 96.3-7-a, -b.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of non-participation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative's April 9, 2015 (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The employer participated personally in the fact-finding interview and is not chargeable. The claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/can