

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TANYA J JOYCE
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-10727-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY
CASEY'S GENERAL STORES**
Employer

**OC: 07-03-11
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the August 5, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on September 9, 2011. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Kitty Frideres, store manager. Employer's Exhibit One was entered and received into the record.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged due to job-related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as an assistant manager, full-time, beginning August 10, 2010, through July 8, 2011, when she voluntarily quit. The claimant last worked on May 18. She was off work after that time due to non-work-related medical issues. She repeatedly turned in her doctor's notes late to the employer. On June 20, the claimant left a note for the store manager dated June 17 that kept her off work until July 5. As was her pattern, the claimant left the note for the employer after hours and days after she had received it from her physician. The note indicated that the claimant would be able to return to work on July 5, 2011. On July 5, the claimant had another doctor's appointment, after which she went to the store after the store manager had left. She did not provide any doctor's note to take her off work after July 5. By July 7 she still had not provided a doctor's note taking her off work after July 5. The claimant lived just across the street from the store manager and could have provided the doctor's notes she received to the manager at her home. She did not do so. The claimant repeatedly turned in her doctor's notes when she knew the manager would not be at the store. When the employer had not heard from the claimant by July 7, Ms. Frideres called her at home to tell her she was discharged for failing to return to work after her last doctor's note expired and for repeatedly failing to keep the

employer informed about her medical condition. The claimant could offer no reason why she did not provide the employer with a doctor's note after her visit on July 5. The claimant easily could have called Ms. Frideres to at least let her know what was going on. After Ms. Frideres left the claimant the message on July 7 telling her that she was discharged, on July 8 the claimant's husband brought in a doctor's note dated July 5 keeping the claimant off work until July 12. The claimant had the ability to provide the doctor's notes to the employer in a timely manner but did not do so.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits after the separation on a claim with an effective date of July 3, 2011.

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(7) provides:

(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 determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. The term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." An absence is an extended tardiness, and an incident of tardiness is a limited absence. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). Absences due to **properly reported** illness or injury cannot constitute job misconduct, since they are not volitional. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was regularly and repeatedly failing to provide the employer with her doctor's notes despite the fact that she could. She was obligated to provide that information to her employer but did not do so. An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or **to be notified** as to when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and that the final absence was not excused, because it was not properly reported. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

The administrative law judge further concludes claimant has been overpaid benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits whether or not the overpayment is recovered. Iowa Code § 96.3(7). In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits.

DECISION:

The August 5, 2011 (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Benefits are withheld until such time as she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

REMAND:

The matter of determining the amount of the potential overpayment and whether the overpayment should be recovered under Iowa Code § 96.3(7)b is remanded to the Agency.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/kjw