IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ARA VOS Claimant

APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-10424-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORP Employer

> OC: 10/07/07 R: 02 Claimant: Respondent (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct 871 IAC 24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Electronic Data Systems Corporation (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated October 29, 2007, reference 01, which held that Ara Vos (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on November 29, 2007. The claimant provided a telephone number but was not available when that number was called for the hearing, and therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Tom Jordan, Operations Manager; Sonja Brewton, Supervisor; and Joe Canfield, Employer Representative. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time telephone agent in the call center from January 3, 2007 through August 22, 2007, when she was terminated for excessive unexcused absenteeism. She was placed on an attendance improvement plan on April 19, 2007. The employer warned her that all absences must be planned and any further unexcused absences could result in discharge. She was required to call in on the attendance line but also needed to speak to either her supervisor or the operations manager. Subsequent to that final warning, she was a no-call/no-show on the following days:

> June 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, and 28 July 2, 9, 16, and 25 August 6, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 22

The employer did not terminate the claimant earlier because she experienced a personal tragedy and also reported that she had some health problems. The employer contacted its short-term disability carrier and filed a claim on her behalf. The claimant was required to provide medical information to Cigna but failed to do so. She had not worked there long enough to qualify for leave under the Family Medical Leave Act. Her last day of work was August 13, 2007. The employer called the claimant on August 20 and 21 and left her a message that she needed to return to work or provide medical excuses. When the claimant did not return the telephone calls by August 22, 2007, the employer sent her a letter of termination.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective October 7, 2007 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

871 IAC 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 to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. <u>Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 321

N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged on August 22, 2007, for excessive unexcused absenteeism. Excessive unexcused absenteeism, a concept which includes tardiness, is misconduct. <u>Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. <u>Id</u>. Excessive absences are not misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. <u>Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was a no-call/no-show 19 times after her final warning.

The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of lowa law.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated October 29, 2007, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because she was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,710.00.

Susan D. Ackerman Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw