IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

BARBARA J QUINN

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-00864-NT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

WAL-MART STORES INC

Employer

OC: 12/30/07 R: 04 Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated January 15, 2008, reference 01, which held the claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on February 11, 2008. The claimant participated. The employer participated by Diane Smull, assistant manager.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with her work.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant worked for this employer from December 16, 2005, until December 28, 2007, when she was discharged from employment. Ms. Quinn worked as a full-time overnight cashier and was paid by the hour.

The claimant was discharged when she exceeded the permissible number of infractions allowed under established company policy. The final incident took place when the claimant called off work on the night of December 27, 2007, due to the serious illness of a small child. The claimant believes that her attendance infractions had not exceeded the permissible number allowed by company policy.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge concludes, based upon the evidence in the record, that the claimant properly reported her most recent absent that was due to a compelling person reason, the illness of a small child.

The Supreme Court of Iowa in the case of <u>Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984) held that absence due to illness or other excusable reasons is deemed excused if the employee properly notifies the employer. The administrative law judge finds that the claimant's reason for being absence was for an excusable reason and that the claimant properly notified the

employer in advance of her impending absence. Intentional disqualifying misconduct on the part of the claimant, therefore, has not been shown.

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.

For the reasons stated herein, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant was discharged under non-disqualifying conditions. Unemployment insurance benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The representative's decision dated January 15, 2008, reference 01, is hereby affirmed. The claimant was discharged under non-disqualifying conditions. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant meets all other eligibility requirements of lowa law.

Terence P. Nice Administrative Law Judge	

Decision Dated and Mailed