

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**HENRY D TAMAYO PAZ**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-15101-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**KEOKUK HILLS BEEF COMPANY LLC**  
Employer

**OC: 10/04/20**  
**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

---

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the June 24, 2021, reference 01, decision that disqualified the claimant for benefits and that relieved the employer's account of liability for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant was discharged on October 6, 2020 for violation of a known company rule. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on August 26, 2021. Claimant participated and was represented by non-attorney representative Juli Hisel. The employer did not provide a telephone number for the hearing and did not participate. Exhibits A through D were received into evidence. Spanish-English interpreter Gisselle Martinez (#12973) of CTS Language Link assisted with the hearing.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed by Keokuk Hills Beef Company, L.L.C. as a full-time laborer until October 5, 2020, when the employer discharged him for attendance. The employer cited a September 28, 2020 absence as the trigger for the discharge. The employer alleged in the discharge documentation that the claimant was a no-call, no-show on September 28, 2020. The employer told the claimant that he was being discharged for being absent too much. On September 28, 2020, claimant was absent due to illness and properly notified the employer. The claimant made several calls to the workplace prior to the scheduled start of the shift. On the ninth attempt, the claimant spoke with an employer representative to give notice of his need to be absent due to illness. The claimant is a Spanish-speaking person. The employer relied on the claimant's supervisor to interpret and translate for the claimant. Neither the interpretation or translation provided accurate information to the claimant.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See *Lee v. Employment Appeal Board*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See *Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board*, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s). The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also *Greene v. EAB*, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate

the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.32(4).

In order for a claimant's absences to constitute misconduct that would disqualify the claimant from receiving unemployment insurance benefits, the evidence must establish that the claimant's *unexcused* absences were excessive. See Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.32(7). The determination of whether absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. However, the evidence must first establish that the most recent absence that prompted the decision to discharge the employee was unexcused. See Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.32(8). Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation and oversleeping are considered unexcused. On the other hand, absences related to illness are considered excused, provided the employee has complied with the employer's policy regarding notifying the employer of the absence. Tardiness is a form of absence. See *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). Employers may not graft on additional requirements to what is an excused absence under the law. See *Gaborit v. Employment Appeal Board*, 743 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007). For example, an employee's failure to provide a doctor's note in connection with an absence that was due to illness properly reported to the employer will not alter the fact that such an illness would be an excused absence under the law. *Gaborit*, 743 N.W.2d at 557.

The evidence in the record establishes an October 5, 2020 discharge for no disqualifying reason. The employer did not participate and did not present any evidence to meet its burden of proving a discharge for disqualifying misconduct in connection with the employment. That absence that triggered the discharge was due to illness, was properly reported to the employer, and was therefore an excused absence under the applicable law. The excused absence cannot serve as a basis for a finding of misconduct or disqualification for unemployment insurance benefits. The evidence establishes no unexcused absences and no other disqualifying misconduct in connection with the employment. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits.

**DECISION:**

The June 24, 2021, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged on October 5, 2020 for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits.



---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

August 31, 2021  
Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/scn