IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

CRYSTAL D MARCOS
Claimant

WAL-MART STORES INC
Employer

APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-06179-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

OC: 06/01/08 R: 04
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Crystal Marcos (claimant) appealed a representative's June 26, 2008 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Wal-Mart Stores (employer) for excessive unexcused absenteeism after having been warned. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for August 5, 2008. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Aaron Schumann, Store Manager.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

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 April 23, 2007, as a full-time cashier. The employer issued the claimant warnings for attendance on December 18, 2007, March 7, and May 18, 2008. All but approximately two of the claimant's absences were due to illness. All absences were properly reported. The claimant provided doctor's excuses for her absences.

On May 27, 2008, the claimant worked for one hour and then reported to the employer that she was ill. She went to her physician who told her not to work for a number of days. The claimant returned to the employer with the note on May 27, 2008. The employer told the claimant the note was not needed. On May 30, 2008, the claimant asked the employer if she could have additional time off because she had been diagnosed with a disorder and did not feel well enough to work. The employer terminated the claimant for excessive absenteeism.

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.

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

> (8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Excessive absences are not misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The employer must establish not only misconduct but that there was a final incident of misconduct which precipitated the discharge. The last incident of absence was a properly reported illness which occurred on May 27, 2008. The claimant's absence does not amount to job misconduct because it was properly reported. The employer has failed to provide any evidence of willful and deliberate misconduct which would be a final incident leading to the discharge. The claimant was discharged but there was no misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's June 26, 2008 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer has not met its proof to establish job related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

_____
Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

_____
Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs