# IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

**VICTOR D HALL** 

Claimant

APPEAL 24A-UI-03680-SN-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**BILLION HAWKEYE INC** 

**Employer** 

OC: 03/10/24

Claimant: Respondent (1)

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

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a - Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer, Billion Hawkeye Inc, filed an appeal from the April 3, 2024, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision granting benefits based upon the determination the claimant was discharged, but misconduct was not shown. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on April 29, 2024, at 10:00 a.m. The claimant participated and testified. The employer participated through Human Resources Manager Jodi Ames. Official notice was taken of the agency records. Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, A, and B were received as evidence.

### **ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

Whether the claimant has been overpaid benefits? Whether the claimant is excused from repayment of benefits due to the employer's non-participation?

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

The claimant worked as a full-time detail technician from December 28, 2022, until he was separated from employment on March 13, 2024, when he was terminated. The claimant's immediate supervisor was Detail Manager Ben Hauser. The claimant worked from 8:00 a.m. through 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

The claimant received an employee handbook digitally on December 21, 2022. The employee handbook has an attendance policy. It states that an employee must inform their supervisor of an anticipated absence as soon as possible. The employer's attendance policy only excuses absences that can be covered by paid time off.

On June 29, 2023, the claimant was given a final written warning regarding his attendance. It also warned the claimant about not taking days off without requesting them through the employer's application for doing so. The employer provided a copy of the written warning. (Exhibit 2)

On December 17, 2023, the claimant clocked in at 10:39 a.m.

On December 18, 2023, the claimant did not arrive at work until 10:40 a.m.

On January 2, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 9:24 a.m.

On January 19, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 8:13 a.m.

On January 23, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 10:06 a.m.

On February 5, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 8:38 a.m.

On February 9, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 8:08 a.m.

On February 16, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 9:13 a.m.

On March 1, 2024, the claimant left work early at 4:30 p.m. This was due to an arrangement he had with Mr. Hauser to pick up his children from school.

On March 4, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 8:58 a.m.

On March 8, 2024, the claimant left work early at 1:54 p.m. The claimant informed Mr. Hauser that there had been a threat at his child's school, and he had to pick him up.

On March 11, 2024, the claimant did not arrive at work until 11:00 a.m. The claimant informed Mr. Hauser about a week prior that he would have court that morning. He reminded Mr. Hauser of these arrangements on the evening of March 10, 2024.

On March 13, 2024, the claimant sent text messages to Mr. Hauser and Service Manager Alex Shalla informing them that he was sick, and he would not be able to work that day. The claimant was told to come in because he would be terminated that day. Ms. Ames met with the claimant and terminated him.

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged on March 13, 2024, due to an absence caused by illness that was properly reported. As a result, the employer cannot show the claimant was discharged due to work-related misconduct. Benefits are granted, provided he is otherwise eligible.

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.

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.

lowa Code section 96.5(2)b, c and d provide:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

- 2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:
- b. Provided further, if gross misconduct is established, the department shall cancel the individual's wage credits earned, prior to the date of discharge, from all employers.
- c. Gross misconduct is deemed to have occurred after a claimant loses employment as a result of an act constituting an indictable offense in connection with the claimant's employment, provided the claimant is duly convicted thereof or has signed a statement admitting the commission of such an act. Determinations regarding a benefit claim may be redetermined within five years from the effective date of the claim. Any benefits paid to a claimant prior to a determination that the claimant has lost employment as a result of such act shall not be considered to have been accepted by the claimant in good faith.
- d. For the purposes of this subsection, "misconduct" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

- (1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.
- (5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual if compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.
- (6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.
- (7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that result in missing work.
- (8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.

## (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.

- (10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.
- (11) Failure to maintain any licenses, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.
- (12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.
- (13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.

(14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 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. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). The lowa Court of Appeals found substantial evidence of misconduct in testimony that the claimant worked slower than he was capable of working and would temporarily and briefly improve following oral reprimands. *Sellers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 531 N.W.2d 645 (lowa Ct. App. 1995). Generally, continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (lowa Ct. App. 1990). Misconduct must be "substantial" to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. *Newman v. lowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (lowa Ct. App. 1984). Poor work performance is not misconduct in the absence of evidence of intent. *Miller v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 423 N.W.2d 211 (lowa Ct. App. 1988).

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. 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). Medical documentation is not essential to a determination that an absence due to illness should be treated as excused. Gaborit, supra. 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(7) (emphasis added); see Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (lowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law." The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore 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 at 192. Second, the absences must be unexcused. Cosper 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 at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." Cosper at 10.

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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (lowa 1984). Absences due to illness or injury must be properly reported in order to be excused. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (lowa 1982).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) and (8) provide:

(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.

(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 terminated the claimant for an absence on March 13, 2024. That absence was properly reported to two supervisors and was due to illness. An absence such as this is explicitly excluded from the definition of misconduct by Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7). It is acknowledged that the claimant had attendance issues prior to the final incident, but past acts are only relevant to the extent that they show the blameworthiness of the final incident. No number of past incidents makes the final incident misconduct in this case. As a result, the employer has not met its burden to show the claimant was discharged on March 13, 2024, due to misconduct. Benefits are granted, provided he is otherwise eligible for benefits.

## **DECISION:**

The April 3, 2024, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. The claimant was discharged on March 13, 2024, due to an absence that was caused by illness and properly reported. This is not misconduct per se. Benefits are granted, provided he is otherwise eligible for benefits.



Sean M. Nelson

Administrative Law Judge II Iowa Department of Inspections & Appeals Administrative Hearings Division – UI Appeals Bureau

May 2, 2024 Decision Dated and Mailed

smn/scn

APPEAL RIGHTS. If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

Employment Appeal Board 6200 Park Avenue Suite 100 Des Moines, Iowa 50321 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

### AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at lowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <a href="https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf">https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf</a> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <a href="https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/">https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/</a>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

**Note to Claimant:** It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

## **SERVICE INFORMATION:**

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN. Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

Employment Appeal Board 6200 Park Avenue Suite 100 Des Moines, Iowa 50321 Fax: (515)281-7191 Online: eab.iowa.gov

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

### UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal https:///www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

**Nota para el reclamante:** es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

## SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.