

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**DAKOTA J SLAUSON**  
Claimant

**BLAZIN WINGS INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 19A-UI-04537-SC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 04/28/19**  
**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

On May 30, 2019, Blazin Wings, Inc. (employer) filed an appeal from the May 20, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination Dakota J. Slauson (claimant) was not discharged for willful or deliberate misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on June 28, 2019. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. The employer participated through General Manager Chase Steinkamp. No exhibits were offered into the record. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, specifically the fact-finding documents and the claimant's claim history.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?  
Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and, if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?  
Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed part-time as a Hospitality Team Member beginning in November 2018, and was separated from employment on April 27, 2019, when he was discharged. The employer has an attendance policy stating three unexcused absences will result in discharge. The claimant was aware of the policy.

On April 10, the claimant was 40 minutes late for his shift. He did not notify the employer that he was going to be late. The next shift he worked, he received a written warning related to attendance. On April 24, the claimant was 45 minutes late for his shift because he overslept. He did not notify the employer he was going to be late. During his next shift worked, he received a final written warning and was told any further absences could result in discharge.

On April 27, the claimant was scheduled to work a split shift. During the morning shift, he told General Manager Chase Steinkamp that he was not going to report for the afternoon shift because he had a gender reveal party to attend. Steinkamp told the claimant that if he did not find anyone to cover his afternoon shift then his absence would be unexcused. The claimant did not find anyone to cover his shift and did not report for the afternoon shift. The claimant was discharged for violation of the attendance policy.

The administrative record reflects that the claimant has not received any unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of April 28, 2019. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview, make a first-hand witness available for rebuttal, or provide written documentation that, without rebuttal, would have resulted in disqualification.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

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:

a. The disqualification shall continue 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 provides, in relevant part:

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.

...

(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.

This definition of misconduct 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).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *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 the 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). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). 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); see *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190, n. 1 (Iowa 1984) holding "rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law."

The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are 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 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, supra*.

An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits; however, an employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified as to 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 final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

As the claimant has not claimed any unemployment insurance benefits prior to this decision, the issue of overpayment is moot and the employer's account will not be charged for any benefits claimed after this decision.

**DECISION:**

The May 20, 2019, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to excessive, unexcused absenteeism. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. As the claimant has not claimed any unemployment insurance benefits prior to this disqualification, the issue of overpayment is moot and the employer's account will not be charged for any benefits claimed after this decision.

---

Stephanie R. Callahan  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn