

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**DARIUS J PHILLIPS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-02183-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**KWIK TRIP INC**  
Employer

**OC: 12/19/10**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Darius Phillips (claimant) appealed a representative's February 22, 2011 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Kwik Trip (employer) for excessive unexcused absenteeism after having been warned. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for March 23, 2011. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Amanda Thoms, Store Leader.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on January 5, 2009, as a part-time guest service co-worker. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on January 5, 2009. The employer issued the claimant warnings on January 5, August 20, October 12, and 22, 2010, for tardiness. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On December 15, 2010, the claimant was absent due to illness but did not report his absence to the employer. The employer suspended the claimant on December 16, 2010, and terminated him on December 18, 2010.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Iowa Code § 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.

871 IAC 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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Excessive absences are not misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. 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. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. 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 employer must establish not only misconduct but that there was a final incident of misconduct which precipitated the discharge. The last incident of absence was an improperly reported illness which occurred on December 15, 2010. The claimant's absence does amount to job misconduct because it was not properly reported. The claimant was discharged for misconduct. He is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

**DECISION:**

The representative's February 22, 2011 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs