

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ROB A SMITH
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 11A-UI-14139-DT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

TPI IOWA LLC
Employer

**OC: 01/16/11
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge
Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Leaving
Section 96.7-2-a(2) – Charges Against Employer’s Account

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Rob A. Smith (claimant) appealed a representative’s October 17, 2011 decision (reference 02) that concluded he was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from TPI Iowa, L.L.C. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties’ last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on November 22, 2011. The claimant participated in the hearing. Danielle Williams appeared on the employer’s behalf. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, a review of the law, and assessing the credibility of the witnesses and reliability of the evidence in conjunction with the applicable burden of proof, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Was there a disqualifying separation from employment either through a voluntary quit without good cause attributable to the employer or through a discharge for misconduct? Is the employer’s account subject to charge?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant started working for the employer on April 18, 2011. He worked full-time as a manufacturing associate on the first shift. His last day of work was July 24, 2011.

On July 24 the claimant fell on a step and bruised his hip area. His team leader told him to leave early, so he did. He then called in on July 25, July 26, July 27, July 28, and July 29, leaving messages for his team lead that he would not be in to work due to his injury. The team lead did not report the claimant’s call-ins to the employer’s human resources department. When it appeared that the claimant had been a no-call, no-show since July 25, on August 1 the employer determined that the claimant had quit the employment and removed him from their system. An exit interview form was sent to the claimant.

On August 3 the claimant received the exit interview form. He immediately called the employer's shift leader and told him he had been calling in, and in fact had a doctor's note covering much of the period of the absence. The shift leader told the claimant to bring the form and the doctor's note in to the office, which he did on August 4. The receptionist indicated she would pass them on for review, but the claimant did not hear anything further back from the employer. He therefore reopened his unemployment insurance claim effective September 25, 2011; he had previously established a claim effective January 16, 2011.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

A claimant is not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits if he quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer or was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code §§ 96.5-1; 96.5-2-a.

Rule 871 IAC 24.25 provides that, in general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. A voluntary leaving of employment requires an intention to terminate the employment relationship and an action to carry out that intent. Bartelt v. Employment Appeal Board, 494 N.W.2d 684 (Iowa 1993); Wills v. Employment Appeal Board, 447 N.W.2d 137, 138 (Iowa 1989). The employer asserted that the claimant was not discharged but that he voluntarily quit. The administrative law judge concludes that the employer has failed to satisfy its burden that the claimant voluntarily quit. Iowa Code §96.6-2. As the separation was not a voluntary quit, it must be treated as a discharge for purposes of unemployment insurance. 871 IAC 24.26(21).

The issue in this case is then whether the employer discharged the claimant for reasons establishing work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. The issue is not whether the employer was right or even had any other choice but to terminate the claimant's employment, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. Infante v. IDJS, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what is misconduct that warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. Pierce v. IDJS, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). 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. Before a claimant can be denied unemployment insurance benefits, the employer has the burden to establish the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct. Cosper v. IDJS, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

In order to establish misconduct such as to disqualify a former employee from benefits, an employer must establish the employee was responsible for a deliberate act or omission that was a material breach of the duties and obligations owed by the employee to the employer. 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445 (Iowa 1979); Henry v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 391 N.W.2d 731, 735 (Iowa App. 1986). The conduct must show a willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior that 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. 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; Huntoon, supra; Henry, supra. In contrast, 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. 871 IAC 24.32(1)a; Huntoon, supra; Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

The reason the employer effectively discharged the claimant was, in essence, his attendance. Excessive and unexcused absenteeism can constitute misconduct. 871 IAC 24.32(7). A determination as to whether an absence is excused or unexcused does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's attendance policy. 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. 871 IAC 24.32(7); Cosper, supra; Gaborit v. Employment Appeal Board, 734 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa App. 2007). Because the final absence was related to properly reported illness or other reasonable grounds, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism occurred that establishes work-connected misconduct and no disqualification is imposed. The employer has not met its burden to show disqualifying misconduct. Cosper, supra. Based upon the evidence provided, the claimant's actions were not misconduct within the meaning of the statute, and the claimant is not disqualified from benefits.

The final issue is whether the employer's account is subject to charge. An employer's account is only chargeable if the employer is a base period employer. Iowa Code § 96.7. The base period is "the period beginning with the first day of the five completed calendar quarters immediately preceding the first day of an individual's benefit year and ending with the last day of the next to the last completed calendar quarter immediately preceding the date on which the individual filed a valid claim." Iowa Code § 96.19-3. The claimant's base period began October 1, 2009 and ended September 30, 2010. The employer did not employ the claimant during this time, and therefore the employer is not currently a base period employer and its account is not currently chargeable for benefits paid to the claimant.

DECISION:

The representative's October 17, 2011 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The claimant did not voluntarily quit; the employer did discharge the claimant, but not for disqualifying reasons. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account is not subject to charge in the current benefit year.

Lynette A. F. Donner
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/kjw