

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**JULIA DAVIS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-10432-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY**  
Employer

**OC: 08/31/08 R: 01**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Casey's Marketing Company (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated October 27, 2008, reference 02, which held that Julia Davis (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on December 9, 2008. The claimant participated in the hearing with her husband, Roger Davis. The employer participated through Sara Luebbert, Supervisor. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time, but went to part-time, donut clerk from June 17, 2002 through August 25, 2008, when she was discharged for one unexcused absence.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

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 to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

The claimant was discharged for one unexcused absence. Excessive unexcused absenteeism, a concept which includes tardiness, is misconduct. Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). However, a single unexcused absence does not constitute excessive unexcused absenteeism. Sallis v. Employment Appeal Board, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The employer has not met its burden. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has not been established in this case and benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated October 27, 2008, reference 02, is affirmed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw