

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ROSS ABEDNEGO

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-10962-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

BEEF PRODUCTS INC

Employer

OC: 06/19/11

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) - Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Ross Abednego (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated August 12, 2011, reference 01, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from Beef Products, Inc. (employer) for work-related misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on September 13, 2011. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Bailey Peak, human resources coordinator, and Jennifer Stubbs, human resources supervisor. Employer's Exhibits One through Four were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time general laborer working third shift from November 25, 2010 through June 21, 2011. He was discharged from employment after three no-call/no-shows within six months. The claimant was a no-call/no-show on January 7, 2011 and he received a written warning on January 11, 2011. He was also retrained on the attendance policy. The employer issued him a second written warning on March 23, 2011 for failure to holster a hose while filling a railcar. The claimant received a three-day suspension and final warning on April 25, 2011 for a second no-call/no-show on April 23, 2011. He was again retrained on the attendance policy.

His final no-call/no-show occurred on June 18, 2011 and resulted in his termination. The employer's attendance policy provides that three no-call/no-shows within one year will result in termination. The claimant had three no-call/no-shows within a six-month period. He testified that the final no-call/no-show was because he was sleeping due to medicine he took for back

pain. The pharmacist told him not to drive while taking the medication, and he could have called in his absence prior to taking the medication but failed to do so.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

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 Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). The claimant was discharged on June 21, 2011 for excessive unexcused absenteeism.

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 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 Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and that the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant’s history of absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 12, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw