

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**CHARLENE FRERICHS
19306 – 130TH ST
AKRON IA 51001**

**WELLS DAIRY INC
PO BOX 1310
LE MARS IA 51031**

**AL STURGEON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
PO BOX 5311
SIOUX CITY IA 51102**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-01348-S2T
OC: 01/02/05 R: 01
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Charlene Frerichs (claimant) appealed a representative's January 24, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she had voluntarily quit employment with Wells Dairy, Inc. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 8, 2005. The claimant was represented by Al Sturgeon, Attorney at Law, and participated personally. The employer participated by Beckie Wahlberg, Senior Human Resources Generalist.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on April 12, 1998, as a full-time production worker. The claimant was granted a leave of absence from October 24 to November 7, 2004, to care for her daughter who was pregnant, ill and had an 18-month old son. The daughter's physician wrote a note for the claimant indicating she could not work from October 24, 2004, through January 1, 2005, in order to care for her daughter. The claimant supplied that note to the employer.

The claimant was granted a two-week leave by her supervisor from November 7 through 19, 2004. On November 21, 2004, the claimant discussed her situation with the employer and the employer said they would review the matter. On November 22 and 23, 2004, the claimant properly reported she was ill with the flu. On November 24, 2004, the employer told the claimant she was to return to work on November 28, 2004.

On November 28, 2004, the claimant telephoned the employer in the afternoon to confirm the shift she was to work. The employer told the claimant she was not scheduled to work, she was off work due to doctor's orders and she should not report to work. On November 29, 2004, the claimant left a message for the employer asking why she was not scheduled. On November 28, 2004, the employer terminated the claimant for failure to appear for work on November 28, 2004.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes she was not.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The employer discharged the claimant and has the burden of proof to show misconduct. The employer did not provide sufficient evidence of misconduct at the hearing. The claimant was first told to appear for work and then told not to appear for work. The claimant followed the employer's instructions and was terminated for doing so. Consequently the employer did not meet its burden of proof to show misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The representative's January 24, 2005 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

bas/sc