

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DANIEL C RIEKER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-01538-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WAL-MART STORES INC
Employer

OC: 12/31/06 R: 02
Claimant: Appellant (2)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Daniel Rieker filed a timely appeal from the February 8, 2007, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 27, 2007. Mr. Rieker participated. Store Manager Mike Hook represented the employer. The hearing in this matter was consolidated with the hearing in Appeal Number 07A-UI-01539-JTT.

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: Daniel Rieker was employed by Wal-Mart as a full-time assembler from February 9, 2005 until January 4, 2007, when Store Manager Mike Hook discharged him for attendance. The final absence that prompted the discharge occurred sometime between December 28 and January 1, when Mr. Hook was absent because he needed to care for his sick children and properly reported the absence to the employer. The employer's written attendance policy required him to notify the employer at least two hours prior to his shift if he needed to be absent. Mr. Rieker had been absent for illness properly reported to the employer on December 1 and had been tardy for personal reasons on December 16. Mr. Rieker's next most recent absences had been on November 3-5 for illness properly reported to the employer. Mr. Rieker's previous absences were primarily for illness properly reported. Mr. Rieker had received warnings for attendance.

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 Mr. Rieker's absences to constitute misconduct that would disqualify him from receiving unemployment insurance benefits, the evidence must establish that his *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).

The greater weight of the evidence in the record establishes that the final absence that prompted the discharge was for illness properly reported to the employer. The absence was an excused absence under the applicable law. Because the final absence was an excused absence under the applicable law, the evidence fails to establish the necessary "current act" upon which a disqualification for unemployment insurance benefits must be based. See 871 IAC 24.32(1)(a). Because there was not "current act," the administrative law judge need not consider prior absences. Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Mr. Rieker was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Accordingly, Mr. Rieker is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits paid to Mr. Rieker.

DECISION:

The Agency representative's February 8, 2007, reference 02, decision is reversed. 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/kjw