

**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**

**SHEILA DILLE
1129 CHICAGO AVE
SAVANNA IL 61074**

**SSW ENTERPRISES INC
COLLIS INC
2005 S 19TH
CLINTON IA 52732**

**Appeal Number: 04A-UI-06342-S2T
OC: 05/02/04 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party request the Appeals Section to reopen the record at the address listed at the top of this decision or 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:

SSW Enterprises (employer) appealed a representative's May 24, 2004 decision (reference 01) that concluded Sheila Dille (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on July 7, 2004. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where she could be reached and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated by Michele Anderson, Human Resources Coordinator.

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 August 13, 2003, as a full-time powder coat

line operator. The claimant received written warnings on February 16, February 23, March 18, and April 23, 2004, regarding absenteeism. She was absent due to illness and personal reasons.

On May 4, 2004, the claimant requested to go home to change her clothes because she had soiled them when she started her menstrual cycle. The employer allowed her to go home to change her clothes. The claimant said she was fine and would be right back. Over an hour later the claimant's husband telephoned the employer. He said the claimant was ill, she went to the emergency room and her cellular telephone battery was dead. The employer told the husband to have his wife call as soon as possible and that she would need a doctor's excuse from the emergency room.

On May 5, 2004, the claimant telephoned the employer. She did not have an excuse from the hospital. The claimant said she waited for two hours but the doctor would not see her because it would not take her type of insurance. The employer questioned the claimant about that. Then, the claimant said the doctor would not see her because she had an outstanding bill. The employer questioned the claimant about that, too. Then, the claimant said she waited for two hours at the hospital and left. The employer terminated the claimant for lying about her absence. The employer investigated and found that the claimant never went to the emergency room at the hospital.

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.

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 has established that the claimant was dishonest with the employer with the intent to take time off work. Employee dishonesty is contrary to the standard of behavior the employer would have a right to expect. In addition, the claimant was discharged for excessive absenteeism after being warned. Three incidents of tardiness or absenteeism after a warning constitutes misconduct. Clark v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982). The claimant was absent for personal reasons after having received four written warnings for absenteeism. The employer has established that the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's May 24, 2004 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

bas/tjc