

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JOHN MARZEN
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 07A-UI-01145-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

EATON CORPORATION
Employer

**OC: 02/05/06 R: 01
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

John Marzen (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated January 24, 2007, reference 03, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from Eaton Corporation (employer) for work-related misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on February 15, 2007. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which a representative could be contacted, and therefore, did not participate. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected 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 employed as a full-time machine operator from March 15, 2006 through December 18, 2006. He was discharged from employment due to excessive unexcused absenteeism with a final incident on December 1, 2006 when he was a no-call/no-show. He was absent due to illness but did not call the employer because he lost his cell phone. He had been warned about attendance, knew his job was in jeopardy and had received a final warning prior to the final absence.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a.

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 employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged on December 18, 2007 for excessive unexcused absenteeism.

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.

Excessive unexcused absenteeism, a concept which includes tardiness, is misconduct. Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. Id. The claimant admitted he had been warned about attendance, knew his job was in jeopardy and was on a final warning for attendance prior to the final no-call/no-show. Although the employer did not participate, the claimant presented sufficient evidence on his own to establish misconduct and warrant a denial of benefits.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated January 24, 2007, reference 03, is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/pjs