

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CARMELITA M JURADO**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-10636-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**L A LEASING INC**  
Employer

**OC: 04-03-11**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the August 1, 2011, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on September 6, 2011. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Casey Lester, accountant manager and Colleen McGuinty unemployment benefits administrator.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged due to job related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was assigned to work at Vangent as a customer service representative beginning on October 4, 2010, through March 4, 2011, when she was discharged due to poor attendance. She had been warned on March 1, that her poor attendance was placing her job in jeopardy. She missed work on March 4 but did not call the employer, Sedona Staffing, to tell them she would not be at work that day. An employee of Sedona left her a message on her voice mail telling her she was discharged due to her poor attendance. The claimant did not call anyone back at Sedona until March 9, 2011 to tell them she was available for additional work assignments. She had accumulated 17 points under the employer's attendance policy.

**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).

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. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

**DECISION:**

The August 1, 2011 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. 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.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/kjw