

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ALYSIA I GORDON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-11071-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

FARLEY'S & SATHERS CANDY CO INC
Employer

OC: 08/19/12
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Alysia Gordon filed a timely appeal from the September 10, 2012, reference 01, decision that denied benefits based on an agency conclusion that she had been discharged on August 20, 2012 for excessive unexcused absences. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 9, 2012. Ms. Gordon was not available at the telephone number she had provided for the hearing and did not participate. Robin Travis, human resource manager, represented the employer. The administrative law judge notes that the hearing time had been moved at Ms. Gordon's request to a time she indicated she could be available. The administrative law judge took official notice of the documents submitted for and generated in connection with the fact-finding interview. The hearing in this matter was consolidated with the hearing in Appeal Number 12A-UI-11072-JTT.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits. The administrative law judge finds that Ms. Gordon was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment based on excessive unexcused absences.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Alysia Gordon was employed by Farley's & Sathers Candy Company as a full-time packaging machine operator from 2010 until August 20, 2012, when the employer discharged her for attendance. Ms. Gordon had last performed work for the employer on August 16, 2012. Between August 4 and August 18, 2012, Ms. Gordon called in absences from work eight times due to a lack of child care for her newborn. There was no medical issue that necessitated the absences. The employer has a no-fault attendance policy and Ms. Gordon's repeat absences subjected her to discharge from the employment under the policy. Ms. Gordon had exhausted available FMLA leave in on July 11, 2012.

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.

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly

be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

In order for a claimant's absences to constitute misconduct that would disqualify the claimant from receiving unemployment insurance benefits, the evidence must establish that the claimant's *unexcused* absences were excessive. See 871 IAC 24.32(7). The determination of whether absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. However, the evidence must first establish that the most recent absence that prompted the decision to discharge the employee was unexcused. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation and oversleeping are considered unexcused. On the other hand, absences related to illness are considered excused, provided the employee has complied with the employer's policy regarding notifying the employer of the absence. Tardiness is a form of absence. See Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). Employers may not graft on additional requirements to what is an excused absence under the law. See Gaborit v. Employment Appeal Board, 743 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007). For example, an employee's failure to provide a doctor's note in connection with an absence that was due to illness properly reported to the employer will not alter the fact that such an illness would be an excused absence under the law. Gaborit, 743 N.W.2d at 557.

The evidence in the record establishes eight absences between August 4 and August 18, 2012. The absences were not based on illness in the child or Ms. Gordon, but instead were based on a basic lack of appropriate child care. The lack of child care was a matter of personal responsibility. Each of the eight absences in question was an unexcused absence under the applicable law.

Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Ms. Gordon was discharged for misconduct. Accordingly, Ms. Gordon is disqualified for benefits until she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account shall not be charged for benefits paid to Ms. Gordon.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's September 10, 2012, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for misconduct. The claimant is disqualified for unemployment benefits until she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit allowance, provided she meets all other eligibility requirements. The employer's account will not be charged.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/kjw