

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**DEREK J BOLLIN
715 MAIN ST Y
CRAIG IA 51031**

**BODEANS BAKING HOLDING CO
2375 INDUSTRIAL RD SW
PO BOX 68
LEMARS IA 51031**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-00903-H2T
OC: 01-02-05 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

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.

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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) – Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the January 25, 2005, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on February 9, 2005. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Jeremy Hunter, Human Resources Manager. Employer's Exhibit One was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a hand packer full time beginning March 1, 2004 through December 21, 2004 when he was discharged. On December 21, 2004 the claimant was to be

at work at 2:00 a.m. The claimant had an upper GI endoscope procedure on December 20, 2004 at approximately 9:00 a.m. and had been granted one half day of sick leave. The employer had been informed prior to the test that the claimant would not be in to work until 2:00 a.m. that evening. At approximately 8:00 p.m. the claimant called second shift and informed them that he was still not feeling well after the medical procedure and that he would not be in to work at all that evening. The claimant properly reported his absence due to illness. The claimant was not required to specifically inform Mr. Hunter of his absences, he was only required to call the second shift and let them know.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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.

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.

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness cannot constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

Because the final absence for which he was discharged was related to properly reported illness, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism has been established and no disqualification is imposed. The claimant had not been informed that he was to specifically call Mr. Hunter to report his absence due to illness. Nowhere in his letter of January 10, 2005 does Mr. Hunter mention that the claimant had previously been informed to call him specifically. The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant did properly report his absence due to illness. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

DECISION:

The January 25, 2005, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

tkh/pjs