

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

DENISE A PIRC
Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-01476-DG-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MERCY HEALTH SERVICES IOWA CORP
Employer

**OC: 01/26/20
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1)d – Voluntary Quitting/Illness or Injury

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 13, 2020, (reference 02) that held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on March 5, 2020. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Frank Shoemaker, Agent and Angela Faber, Chief Human Resources Officer. Employer's Exhibits 1-5 were admitted into evidence.

ISSUES:

Did claimant voluntarily leave the employment with good cause attributable to employer or did employer discharge her for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant last worked for employer on July 25, 2019. Employer discharged claimant on January 10, 2020, because claimant was on a medical leave of absence and could not return to work.

Claimant began working for employer as a full-time Licensed Practical Nurse in September, 1994. Claimant began having health issues in the summer of 2019. Claimant requested a medical leave of absence and it was granted on July 25, 2019.

Employer received notice from Hartford, its third party vendor that claimant's short-term disability benefits were going to expire on December 5, 2019. Claimant was contacted and told by employer that she would continue to be employed as long as she was eligible for short-term disability benefits. She further was advised that her employment could be terminated if her short term disability benefits expired.

Claimant contacted her doctor and explained what she had learned from employer. Claimant was later told by her physician that she would be released back to work without restrictions on January 6, 2020. Claimant informed employer that a release was forthcoming.

In early January, 2020 claimant contacted her physician to check on the status of her written release back to work. The doctor's staff informed claimant that her doctor was out of town attending to a personal emergency. Claimant informed employer that she was being released back to work on January 6, 2020 but she would not have a written document to that effect because her doctor was unavailable.

On January 6, 2020 employer had not received a release from claimant's doctor. On January 10, 2020 employer decided to terminate claimant's employment. Claimant's doctor sent a letter to claimant and employer on January 29, 2020 releasing claimant back to work effective January 6, 2020.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant did not quit but was discharged for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code section 96.5(1)d provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. *Voluntary quitting.* If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department. But the individual shall not be disqualified if the department finds that:

d. The individual left employment because of illness, injury or pregnancy upon the advice of a licensed and practicing physician, and upon knowledge of the necessity for absence immediately notified the employer, or the employer consented to the absence, and after recovering from the illness, injury or pregnancy, when recovery was certified by a licensed and practicing physician, the individual returned to the employer and offered to perform services and the individual's regular work or comparable suitable work was not available, if so found by the department, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(35) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving Iowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(35) The claimant left because of illness or injury which was not caused or aggravated by the employment or pregnancy and failed to:

- a. Obtain the advice of a licensed and practicing physician;
- b. Obtain certification of release for work from a licensed and practicing physician;

- c. Return to the employer and offer services upon recovery and certification for work by a licensed and practicing physician; or
- d. Fully recover so that the claimant could perform all of the duties of the job.

Disqualification from benefits pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.5(1) requires a finding that the quit was voluntary. *Geiken v. Lutheran Home for the Aged Ass'n*, 468 N.W.2d 223, 226 (Iowa 1991). An absence is not voluntary if returning to work would jeopardize the employee's health. A physician's work restriction is evidence an employee is not medically able to work. *Wilson Trailer Co. v. Iowa Emp't. Sec. Comm'n*, 168 N.W.2d 771, 775-6 (Iowa 1969).

Where an employee did not voluntarily quit but was terminated while absent under medical care, the employee is allowed benefits and is not required to return to the employer and offer services pursuant to the subsection d exception of Iowa Code section 96.5(1). *Prairie Ridge Addiction Treatment Servs. v. Jackson and Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 810 N.W.2d 532 (Iowa Ct. App. 2012).

The claimant is not required to return to the employer to offer services after the medical recovery because she has already been involuntarily terminated from the employment while under medical care. The involuntary termination from employment while under medical care was a discharge from employment. Thus, the burden of proof shifts to the employer.

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.

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).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute work-connected misconduct since they are not volitional, even if the employer was fully within its rights to assess points or impose discipline up to or including discharge for the absence under its attendance policy. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); *Cosper*, supra; *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 734 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007).

Even had the claimant's leave period expired, since claimant was still under medical care and had not yet been released to return to work without restriction as of the date of separation, no disqualifying reason for the separation has been established. Benefits are allowed, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The February 13, 2020, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant did not quit but was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. The benefits withheld based upon this separation shall be paid to claimant.

Duane L. Golden
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/scn