

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**BRIAN D SHAULL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-08083-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**NPC INTERNATIONAL INC  
PIZZA HUT**  
Employer

**OC: 06/03/12**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Pizza Hut (employer) appealed a representative's June 26, 2012 decision (reference 01) that concluded Brian Shaull (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 scheduled for July 30, 2012. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Kathy Champagne, area manager.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired in August 2010 as a part-time cook/server/driver. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook. The employer did not issue the claimant any warnings during his employment. The claimant did not appear for work or notify the employer of his absence on February 16 and 22, 2012. His mother was in the hospital and he overslept for his shift after being up all night with her. The employer never issued the claimant any warnings for those absences, because it knew the claimant's mother was ill.

On March 11, 2012, the claimant's mother went to the emergency room. He got home at 7:00 a.m. on March 12, 2012, and overslept for his 11:00 a.m. shift. The employer terminated the claimant for his absence.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for 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(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 establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. Employers have a right to have employees appear for work when scheduled. In this case the claimant thought the employer was excusing his absence due to his mother's illness when the employer did not issue him a warning or say something to him about his absence.

Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned the claimant about any of the issues leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or negligently in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given. Employers have a right to have employees appear for work when scheduled.

**DECISION:**

The representative's June 26, 2012 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The employer has not met its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw