

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

THERESA J BENEDICT
Claimant

PRESTAGE FOODS OF IOWA LLC
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-07274-DB-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 01/03/21
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the March 1, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that found the claimant was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits following her discharge from employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 20, 2021. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through witness Carol McClurg. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records.

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 production team member from March 1, 2019 until January 7, 2021, when she was discharged from employment.

The employer has an attendance policy which provides that an employee may be discharged if they reach 10 attendance points. The employer has another policy that provides an employee may be discharged if they leave the production line without authorization from a supervisor. Claimant was aware of both policies.

On January 5, 2021, the claimant was ill and could not continue in her job duties. She had previously spoken to her supervisor earlier in the shift and let him know she may need help because she was not feeling well. She searched for her supervisor, Travis Valla, but could not find him. She looked for other team leads but was unable to find a supervisor. She ran into Mr. Valla in the hallway and told him that she could not continue working because she was ill. Claimant told Mr. Valla something along the lines of "I am out of here, I can't take it today and I don't feel good enough to deal with this shit". She then left the facility.

Claimant called off due to illness on January 6, 2021 as she was still sick. She returned to work on January 7, 2021 and was discharged for leaving the production line without her supervisor's

permission. Claimant still had unused absences under their 10-point policy and was not discharged for violation of the attendance policy. Claimant had received a previous discipline for leaving the production line without permission on December 28, 2020 but the claimant disagreed with the warning and refused to sign it.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes as follows:

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(4) provides:

(4) Report required. The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r.871-24.32(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.

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.

Unemployment statutes should be interpreted liberally to achieve the legislative goal of minimizing the burden of involuntary unemployment.” *Cosper v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6, 10 (Iowa 1982). The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Id.* at 11. Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. *Id.* at 10. 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. *Gaborit v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 743 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. *Id.* at 558.

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 (Iowa 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*, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (Iowa 1984).

Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10 (Iowa 1982). The requirement of “unexcused” can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for “reasonable grounds,” *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191 or because it was not “properly reported.” *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191 (Iowa 1984) and *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10 (Iowa 1982). Excused absences are those “with appropriate notice.” *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10 (Iowa 1982).


In this case, the claimant was not discharged under the employer’s attendance policy as she still had unused absences before she reached ten points; rather, she was discharged for leaving the production line without a supervisor’s approval. Insubordination can manifest in several different ways. An employer has the right to expect an employee to follow reasonable directions. *Myers v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 373 N.W.2d 507 (Iowa Ct. App. 1985). Willful misconduct can be established where an employee manifests an intent to disobey a future reasonable instruction of his employer. *Id.* Misconduct can be found when a claimant was discharged for refusing to complete job tasks after his shift because he created the extra job tasks by working too slow. *Boyd v. Iowa Dept. of Job Serv.*, 377 N.W.2d 1 (Iowa Ct. App.

1985). Continued refusal to follow reasonable instructions constitutes misconduct. *Gilliam v. Atlantic Bottling Co.*, 453 N.W.2d 230 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). For example, the refusal of a prison guard to answer questions on his private drug use constitutes job misconduct since the prison's rule requiring him to disclose this information was necessary to the functioning of the prison system. *Ross v. Iowa State Penitentiary*, 376 N.W.2d 642 (Iowa App. 1985). However, if the request was unreasonable or the claimant had a good faith belief or good cause to refuse the request, no misconduct would be found. *Woods v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 327 N.W.2d 768, 771 (Iowa Ct. App. 1982)(an employee's failure to perform a specific task may not constitute misconduct if such failure is in good faith or for good cause). An instruction is reasonable if it presents no hardship to the employee and no threat to his or her health, safety, or morals. *Endicott v. Iowa Dep't of Job Services*, 367 N.W.2d 300, 304 (Iowa App. 1985)(finding misconduct based on employee's unreasonable refusal to work overtime after employer's short-notice request).

In this case, claimant was ill and informed her supervisor that she needed to leave work due to illness. While she did not do it in the most tactful way, she still notified her supervisor that she was ill and needed to leave work. She could not initially find her supervisor when she was on the production line and had to leave the production line in an attempt to find him. She notified her supervisor in the hallway that she was ill and needed to leave work, as such, the claimant had good cause to leave the production line and to leave work without her supervisor's express permission. Without establishing a current act of job-related misconduct, this separation from employment is not disqualifying. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The March 1, 2021 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision denying benefits is reversed. Claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided she is otherwise eligible.



Dawn Boucher
Administrative Law Judge

May 28, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

db/scn