

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ROCHELL M FRAZIER**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-05987-MT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OZARK AUTOMOTIVE DISTRIBUTORS INC**  
Employer

**OC: 03/15/09**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated April 13, 2009, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on May 13, 2009. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Whitney Smith, Human Resource Supervisor. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on January 7, 2009.

Claimant was discharged on January 7, 2009 by employer because claimant was late for work. Claimant came in 15 minutes late for work. Claimant asserts she was late due to carpal tunnel syndrome which slowed her preparation for work. Claimant has no medical records to prove she was suffering from work-related carpal tunnel as of January 7, 2009. Employer did not know claimant was suffering from carpal tunnel until after the separation. Claimant did not call in to say she would be late. Claimant had a final warning on her record January 2, 2009. Claimant had three prior late arrivals to work on her record March 24, 2009, June 2, 2009 and June 17, 2009. Claimant was on notice that her job was in jeopardy based on three prior warnings given pursuant to the employer's progressive disciplinary procedure.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF 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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

(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 gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. The Iowa Supreme Court has opined that one unexcused absence is not misconduct even when it followed nine other excused absences and was in violation of a direct order. Sallis v. EAB, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that the absences must be both excessive and unexcused. The Iowa Supreme Court has held that excessive is more than one. Three incidents of tardiness or absenteeism after a warning has been held misconduct. Clark v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982). While three is a reasonable interpretation of excessive based on current case law and Webster's Dictionary, the interpretation is best derived from the facts presented.

In this matter, the evidence established that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning absenteeism. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

The last incident, which brought about the discharge, constitutes misconduct because claimant's instances of coming to work late are not excusable. The accumulation of three or

more absences or late arrivals to work is excessive unexcused absenteeism. This is a violation of a known company rule after being warned. The allegation that claimant was late due to injury is not an excuse where claimant failed to provide a doctor's report showing that she was suffering from carpal tunnel. The employer was not informed of the medical reason for coming in late. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated April 13, 2009, reference 01, is affirmed. Unemployment insurance benefits shall be withheld until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Marlon Mormann  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/css