IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

GERANAMO CLARK

Claimant

APPEAL 16A-UI-06650-DL-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

CRST VAN EXPEDITED INC

Employer

OC: 04/03/16

Claimant: Appellant (2-R)

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the June 6, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 30, 2016. Claimant participated. Employer participated through human resource specialist, Kim Bateman.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed full-time as a over-the-road truck driver from May 29, 2015, and was separated from employment on December 30, 2015, when he was discharged. His last day of work was November 25, 2015. He was not able to work while going through a sleep study and needed to complete that before he could return to work. He was in contact throughout the process and on December 30, 2015, he notified the employer it would be another week before he would receive results. The employer did not give him a deadline to provide test results or return to work. He was still under medical care when he was discharged. He cannot complete his DOT physical until the sleep apnea study, which he had to begin again after the separation, is completed. He expects those results next week. He was last authorized to drive with a CDL on November 25, 2015. He has not worked since then. The issues of his ability to and availability for work and whether he has been making an earnest and active search for work have not yet been addressed by the IWD Benefits Bureau.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason.

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.

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).

In spite of the expiration of the unofficial leave period, since claimant was still under medical care and had not yet been released to return to work or obtain his CDL 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 June 6, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

REMAND:

dml/pjs

The ability to and availability for work, and the work search issues delineated in the findings of fact are remanded to the Benefits Bureau of Iowa Workforce Development for an initial investigation and determination.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed