

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**TIM M BAUSMAN**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-01082-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**PROGRESSIVE PROCESSING LLC**  
Employer

**OC: 12/29/13**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the January 21, 2014, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 19, 2014. Claimant Tim Bausman participated. Bren Banwart represented the employer. The administrative law judge took official notice of the agency's record of benefits disbursed to the claimant and received Exhibits One through Seven into evidence.

The fact-finding materials were not available at the time of the appeal 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: Tim Bausman was employed by Progressive Processing, L.L.C., as a full-time production associate from 2010 until December 30, 2013, when the employer discharged him for attendance. Mr. Bausman's work hours were 9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., Monday evening through Saturday morning. If Mr. Bausman needed to be absent from work, the employer's policy required that he notify the employer no later than 30 minutes prior to the start of the shift. Mr. Bausman was aware of the policy. The employer had no specific policy regarding notice to the employer if an employee was going to be late.

The final absence that triggered the discharge occurred on December 27, 2013, when Mr. Bausman was late to work because he had overslept. All but one of Mr. Bausman prior absences had been due to illness and had been properly reported to the employer. The remaining absence, on March 29, 2013, was due to personal issues that Mr. Bausman's daughter was experiencing. Mr. Bausman had reported that absence to the employer as an absence due to illness.

The employer had issued multiple warnings to Mr. Bausman based on his absences.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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 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 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

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 871 IAC 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 871 IAC 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 two absences that would be unexcused absences under the applicable law. Those absences were the final absence and the absence in March 2013 that was based on Mr. Bausman's daughter's relationship issues. The rest of Mr. Bausman's absences were due to illness, were properly reported to the employer and, therefore, were excused absences under the applicable law. The evidence fails to establish excessive unexcused absences.

Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Mr. Bausman was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, Mr. Bausman is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits.

**DECISION:**

The Claims Deputy's January 21, 2014, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/pjs