

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SANTO OBURAK
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 07A-UI-09443-ET

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**PRAIRIE MEADOWS RACETRACK
& CASINO**
Employer

OC: 09-09-07 R: 02
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the October 4, 2007, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on October 23, 2007. The claimant participated in the hearing. Brian Coy, Training Manager, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time housekeeper for Prairie Meadows Racetrack & Casino from March 13, 2006 to September 12, 2007. The claimant asked for time off to return to his homeland and was scheduled to leave August 18, 2007. He was a no-call no-show August 17, 2007. His supervisor called him and the claimant said he was supposed to have August 17, 2007, off work but his supervisor informed him that was not the case. The claimant signed a shift trade agreement so he could have September 2 and 3, 2007, off work and work instead on September 4 and 5, 2007. He was a no-call no-show September 4, 2007, and went in to pick up his check September 5, 2007, but did not report for his scheduled shift on that date. On September 6, 2007, the employer met with the claimant about his no-calls August 17, September 4 and September 5, 2007, and terminated his employment September 12, 2007.

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(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 claimant was a no-call no-show August 17, September 4 and September 5, 2007, in violation of the employer's policy and could not provide a good cause reason for his absences. While one no-call no-show might be understandable, three in the span of three weeks is excessive. Consequently, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's conduct demonstrated a willful disregard of the standards of behavior the employer has the right to expect of employees and shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer has met its burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The October 4, 2007, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/pjs