

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**AMANDA P DUNBAR**

Claimant

**CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY**

Employer

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-05567-PT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 03/27/11**

**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated April 21, 2011, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on June 14, 2011. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Randy Denham, store manager. Employer's Exhibit 1 and Claimant's Exhibit A were admitted into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant was employed from April 11, 2009 through March 21, 2011. She was an assistant manager and was discharged for absenteeism. Her last absence was on March 18, 2011. She was absent because her daughter who lives in Wisconsin had attempted suicide. Claimant learned about this overnight and sent a text message to her supervisor. She attempted to call her supervisor after the store had opened but was unable to get cell phone service where she was located in Wisconsin.

Claimant received a warning on February 28, 2011 regarding attendance. She was instructed at that time that she needed to call her manager personally if she was going to be absent rather than leaving a message with other employees. The record does not reflect any other warnings for attendance. Claimant had absences on November 4 and 11, 2010, January 20, 2011 and February 1, 2011 that were due to illness. These absences were reported to the employer well in advance of her shift.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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(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.

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 gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation. The Iowa Supreme Court has opined that one unexcused absence is not misconduct even when it followed nine other excused absences and was in violation of a direct order. Sallis v. EAB, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job

Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that the absences must be both excessive and unexcused. The Iowa Supreme Court has held that excessive is more than one. Three incidents of tardiness or absenteeism after a warning has been held misconduct. Clark v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982). While three is a reasonable interpretation of excessive based on current case law and Webster's Dictionary, the interpretation is best derived from the facts presented.

The last absence was not properly reported as claimant did not speak directly to her manager regarding her absence. If she was unable to obtain cell phone service she should have located another telephone and called the employer personally. However, the record does not establish excessive unexcused absenteeism. No disqualification is imposed.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated April 21, 2011, reference 01, is reversed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

---

Ron Pohlman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/pjs