

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

DEXTER S CHISM
3421 AVE 'N' APT 238
FT MADISON IA 52627

REMEDY TEMPORARY SERVICES INC
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 66864
ST LOUIS MO 63166-6864

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-08232-HT
OC: 06/20/04 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (1)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Remedy Temporary Services, Inc. (Remedy), filed an appeal from a decision dated July 22, 2004, reference 03. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Dexter Chism. After due notice was issued a hearing was held by telephone conference call on August 24, 2004. The claimant participated on his own behalf. The employer participated by On-Site Manager Kim Amandus.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having examined all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Dexter Chism was employed by Remedy from November 3, 2003 until June 21, 2004. He was assigned to the Scott Company for the entire period of his employment.

On or about May 1, 2004, the claimant received a written warning for absenteeism. The warning notified him his job was in jeopardy and required him to provide a doctor's excuse for all absences or tardies within the next 30 days. He did miss 6 days after the warning but did have doctor's excuses.

Mr. Chism was absent on June 18, 19, and 20, 2004. He notified Remedy and the Scott Company on each of those days. He was absent because of problems with his high blood pressure which caused dizziness and he had seen his doctor on Friday, June 18, 2004. The doctor provided him with an excuse from work for those three days. Before he could return to work the evening of Monday, June 21, 2004, he was notified he was discharged and did not have an opportunity to present his doctor's excuse.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant is disqualified. The judge concludes he is 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, (7) provide:

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).

(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 employer discharged the claimant for absenteeism after being warned. However, he did notify the company as required on each of the days he was absent, and did have a doctor's excuse for the three days he was gone. A properly reported illness cannot be considered misconduct as it is not volitional. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Disqualification may not be imposed.

DECISION:

The representative's decision of July 22, 2004, reference 03, is affirmed. Dexter Chism is qualified for benefits provided he is otherwise eligible.

bgh/kjf