

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

HEATHER R CONDUFF
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-06695-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

JOSEPH L ERTL INC
Employer

OC: 05/13/12
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code Section 871 IAC 24.32(8) – Current Act Requirement

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Heather Conduff filed a timely appeal from the May 31, 2012, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on June 28, 2012. Ms. Conduff participated. Jane Ertl, Vice President, represented the employer and presented additional testimony through Deb Fangmann, Human Resources Representative. Exhibits One through Five were received into evidence.

ISSUES:

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

Whether the discharge was based on a current act.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Heather Conduff was employed by Joseph L. Ertl, Inc., as a full-time machine operator from June 2011 until May 15, 2012, when the employer discharged her for attendance. The final absence that triggered the discharge was Ms. Conduff's late arrival on April 26, 2012. The employer documented the absence as being based on illness. The employer does not know whether Ms. Conduff properly reported the absence. Ms. Conduff worked the remainder of her shift that day and continued to report for work and perform her duties until May 15, 2012. When Ms. Conduff arrived for work on May 15, the employer summoned her to a meeting and discharged from the employment. The employer did not speak to Ms. Conduff about the April 26 late arrival until the time of the discharge on May 15. In making the decision to discharge Ms. Conduff from the employment the employer considered other absences and warnings. The next most recent absence had been on April 13.

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 fails to establish a current act. The final incident that triggered the discharge was Ms. Conduff's late arrival on April 26, 2012. The late arrival would have to have come to the employer's attention that same day when Ms. Conduff appeared for work halfway through her shift. The employer delayed until May 15, 2012 to take up the matter with Ms. Conduff, at which time the employer discharged her from the employment. The employer has not presented a reasonable basis for the 19-day delay between the conduct and the discussion with Ms. Conduff. The administrative law judge notes that the employer has not presented sufficient evidence to establish that the absence on April 26 was an unexcused absence under the applicable law. In the absence of a current act of misconduct, the discharge would not disqualify Ms. Conduff for unemployment insurance benefits. See Iowa Admin. Code section 871 IAC 24.32(8). In the absence of a current act of misconduct, the administrative law judge need not consider the earlier absences and warnings. Ms. Conduff was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, Ms. Conduff is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to Ms. Conduff.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's May 31, 2012, reference 01, decision is reversed. The discharge was not based on a current act. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/css