IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

BARBARA J LOTT

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-17457-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

LIBERTY FOOD SERVICE INC

Employer

OC: 10/25/09

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Barbara Lott (claimant) appealed a representative's November 13, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Liberty Food Service (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 December 30, 2009. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Patrick Kruger, General 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 considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on May 13, 2009, as a full-time cashier/cook. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on May 13, 2009. The handbook states that an employee will be terminated for failure to properly report an absence. The employer issued the claimant a written warning on May 29, 2009, for failure to notify the employer of her absence from work. On June 10, 2009, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for absenteeism.

On September 17, 2009, the claimant was incarcerated. She did not appear for work or notify the employer of her absence. The employer terminated the claimant on September 18, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was 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(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).

An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unreported absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not properly reported. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of failure to report absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

DECISION:

bas/css

The representative's November 13, 2009 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Beth A. Scheetz	
Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	