# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**SHAUN TOURNIER** 

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-05100-ET** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

**DECISION** 

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC

Employer

OC: 03-08-09

Claimant: Appellant (1)

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

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the March 25, 2009, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on April 28, 2009. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

#### ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a full-time production worker for Tyson Fresh Meats from June 25, 2008 to March 9, 2009. The employer allows employees to accumulate 14 attendance points before termination occurs. The claimant was warned about his attendance and the employer provided slips of paper to him with his point total on them but the claimant "tossed them away" because he did not think he had many points and consequently did not know how many points he had. The claimant became homeless March 2, 2009, and lived in his car that week. He did not go to work during that week. His supervisor told him to come in March 9, 2009, to talk and he was terminated that day for violating the employer's attendance policy. There is no evidence that these absences were related to illness.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying job misconduct.

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.

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. lowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (lowa 1984). While it is unfortunate that the claimant was living in his car for a week and missed work, his absences that week put him over the employer's allowed attendance points. 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 absenteeism, is considered excessive. Therefore, benefits must be denied.

### **DECISION:**

je/css

The March 25, 2009, reference 01, decision is affirmed. 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.

Julie Elder Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	