

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

BEVERLY SAMUEL
Claimant

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

APPEAL 20A-UI-05710-J1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 03/01/20
Claimant: APPELLANT (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timely appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On June 10, 2020, the claimant filed an appeal from the March 18, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based on excessive unexcused absenteeism. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on July 6, 2020. Claimant participated. Employer did not participate. Three calls were made to the phone number provided by the employer and all three calls went to voice mail.

The employer submitted to the Appeals Bureau thirty-one pages of documents on July 2, 2020. The employer did not participate at the hearing and they were not admitted into evidence. Even if the documents had been admitted they would not have changed the outcome of this decision. Claimant offered exhibits which were admitted as Exhibit A. The hearing was interpreted.

ISSUES:

Was the appeal timely?
Did the claimant commit job related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on July 7, 2017. Claimant last worked as a full-time meat cutter. Claimant was separated from employment on November 7, 2019 for violating the employers' attendance point system. Claimant testified that when she was absent from work she would provide a doctor's excuse to her employer. Claimant testified that she would receive points for excused absences.

Claimant is from the Marshall Islands and does not speak English. Claimant speaks Marshallese. Claimant let the local Workforce Development Office know she did not speak English when she applied for benefits. The Fact Finding decision was sent to the claimant in English. Claimant went to her local Workforce Development office on June 10, 2020 to check on the status of her

application. On that date she was informed she was disqualified. On Jun 10, 2020 claimant filed her appeal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the appellant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant.

The claimant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not sent in a language she understood. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The claimant filed an appeal within a reasonable period of time after discovering the disqualification. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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

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.

871 IAC 24.32(7); See *Higgins v. IDJS*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190 n. 1 (Iowa 1984) (“rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law”).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. Disqualifying conduct cannot be predicated on a mere arrest unsupported by a conviction or other credible evidence of the claimant's intentional conduct. *Irving v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 883 N.W.2d 179 (Iowa 2016) (citing *In re Benjamin*, 572 N.Y.S.2d 970, 972 (App. Div. 1991)(per curiam)).

In order to show misconduct due to absenteeism, the employer must establish the claimant had excessive absences that were unexcused. Thus, the first step in the analysis is to determine whether the absences were unexcused. 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. Absences due to properly reported illness are excused, 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*, supra; *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*, supra.

The evidence presented at the hearing was that the absences claimant had were excused.

The second step in the analysis is to determine whether the unexcused absences were excessive. Excessive absenteeism has been found when there has been seven unexcused absences in five months; five unexcused absences and three instances of tardiness in eight months; three unexcused absences over an eight-month period; three unexcused absences over seven months; and missing three times after being warned. *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (Iowa 1984); *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984); *Armel v. EAB*, 2007 WL 3376929*3 (Iowa App. Nov. 15, 2007); *Hiland v. EAB*, No. 12-2300 (Iowa App. July 10, 2013); and *Clark v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982). Excessiveness by its definition implies an amount or degree too great to be reasonable or acceptable.

The evidence in the record does not show excessive unexcused absences. The employer is free to adopt a point system for attendance. That system does not however define misconduct under the law. The employer has failed to prove claimant committed job related misconduct.

The claimant was discharged for no disqualifiable reason.

Note to Claimant: This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations, but who are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>.

DECISION:

The claimant's appeal is timely. The claimant did not commit job related misconduct. The claimant is eligible for unemployment benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible.



James F. Elliott
Administrative Law Judge

July 14, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

je/scn