IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

PAIGE DEMARIS Claimant **CENTRAL BANK** Employer	**APPEAL 21A-UI-15063-DZ-T** **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION** **OC: 05/02/21** **Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Paige DeMaris, the claimant/appellant, filed an appeal from the June 24, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 25, 2021. Ms. DeMaris participated and testified. The employer participated through Jessie Kies, vice president and human resources officer, and Katelyn Mateer, human resources generalist. Claimant's Exhibits A and B were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

Was Ms. DeMaris discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Ms. DeMaris began working for the employer on November 30, 2020. She worked as a full-time teller 1. She was separated from employment on April 8, 2021.

The employer's policy provides that employees who are absent for three consecutive days due to illness must provide a doctor's note. Employees who do not do so are subject to discipline up to and including termination of employment. Ms. DeMaris acknowledged receiving a copy of the policy on her hire date.

On February 9, 2021, Ms. DeMaris was issued a verbal warning for leaving work early without notifying her supervisor and for absences. The warning provided that the employer would review the situation in 30 days, and that Ms. DeMaris was subject to discipline up to, and including, termination of employment for any additional violations of the employer's policy.

On April 5, 6 and 7, Ms. DeMaris texted her supervisor to let them know she would not be attending work because she was sick. On April 7, Ms. DeMaris' supervisor asked her to provide a doctor's note. At about 7:30 a.m. on April 8, Ms. DeMaris texted her supervisor to let them know that she could not get an appointment at the doctor until that day. The supervisor asked

Ms. DeMaris to call them, which she did. The supervisor told Ms. DeMaris that her employment was terminated, effective immediately. The supervisor did not tell Ms. DeMaris why her employment was terminated. On April 9, the employer sent Ms. DeMaris a letter providing information about her final paycheck and other administrative matters. The letter did not give a reason for why the employer terminated Ms. DeMaris' employment. Ms. Kies testified that the employer terminated Ms. DeMaris' employment for not providing a doctor's note per the employer's policy.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes Ms. DeMaris was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

> (8) *Past acts of misconduct*. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The purpose of this rule is to assure that an employer does not save up acts of misconduct and spring them on an employee when an independent desire to terminate arises.

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). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984).

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 192 (Iowa 1984). Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds," *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10.

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*, 321 N.W.2d at 9; *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 734 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007). Medical documentation is not essential to a determination that an absence due to illness should be treated as excused. *See Gaborit*, 734 N.W.2d at 555-558. An employer's no-fault absenteeism policy or point system is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191. When claimant does not provide an excuse for an absence the absences is deemed unexcused. *Id.*; *see also Spragg v. Becker-Underwood, Inc.*, 672 N.W.2d 333, 2003 WL 22339237 (Iowa App. 2003). 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.

In an at-will employment environment an employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if

the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy.

The most recent incident leading to Ms. DeMaris' discharge must be a current act of misconduct in order to disqualify her from receiving benefits. In this case, the most recent act for which Ms. DeMaris was discharged was because she did not provide a doctor's note to the employer after she was absent on April 5, 6 and 7. Ms. DeMaris told her supervisor each day that she would be absent due to illness. As soon as she was able to on April 8, Ms. DeMaris told the employer that she was going to see the doctor. This is not misconduct. The employer has failed to meet its burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The June 24, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Ms. DeMaris was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible. Any benefits claimed and withheld on this basis shall be paid.

_____

Daniel Zeno
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

August 31, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

dz/mh