

**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**

**ELLEN K BOWMAN  
1213 ½ EASTERN AVE  
DAVENPORT IA 52803**

**FRONTIER MGMT CORP  
2300 LINCOLNWAY  
CLINTON IA 52732**

**Appeal Number: 04A-UI-09605-LT  
OC: 08-01-04 R: 04  
Claimant: Respondent (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/Misconduct  
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Absenteeism  
Section 96.3-7 - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed a timely appeal from the August 24, 2004, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on September 28, 2004. Claimant did not participate. Employer did participate through Michael Brisch. Employer's Exhibit One was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a part-time housekeeper through July 15, 2004 when she was discharged.

On July 12, claimant was a no-call/no-show after having been warned to notify employer of her intention or ability to report to work. She was also a no-call/no-show on July 13 and 22, 2003. She was absent related to illness 22 days from July 13 to February 8, 2004. Employer asked her to provide medical excuses for her absences related to illness because of the frequency of those absences. She was also notified twice in writing that she must either contact employer or make herself available for employer to contact her on claimant's on-call days. (Employer's Exhibit One) Claimant was unable to afford health insurance.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of August 1, 2004.

#### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

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(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.

The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. The term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused as it was not reported. While claimant could not afford health insurance, she was aware that due to the frequency of her absences related to illness, that she must provide some documentation about her inability to work on those days and she must maintain communication with employer on scheduled and on-call days. The claimant failed to communicate with employer and the final unreported absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unreported, unexcused absenteeism (the two days of no-call/no-show in July 2003), is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

Iowa Code Section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The August 24, 2004, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as 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 claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$651.00.

dml/kjf