

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DANIEL A SANDERSON
Claimant

PILOT TRAVEL CENTERS LLC
Employer

APPEAL 22A-UI-05236-AD-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 01/30/22
Claimant: Respondent (2R)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On February 24, 2022, Pilot Travel Centers LLC (employer/appellant) filed an appeal from the Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) decision dated February 18, 2022 (reference 01) that allowed unemployment insurance benefits based on a finding that claimant was dismissed from work on January 6, 2022 without a showing of misconduct.

A telephone hearing was held on April 7, 2022. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. Employer participated by General Manager Angie Drinovsky. Daniel Sanderson (claimant/respondent) participated personally.

Employer’s Exhibits 1-3 were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUE(S):

- I. Was the separation a layoff, discharge for misconduct, or voluntary quit without good cause?
- II. Was the claimant overpaid benefits? Should claimant repay benefits or should employer be charged due to employer participation in fact finding?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

Claimant worked for employer as a part-time maintenance person. Claimant’s first day of employment was September 24, 2021. Claimant’s immediate supervisor was Maintenance Lead Sonny. Ms. Drinovsky discharged claimant on January 10, 2022, due to absenteeism.

Claimant had four consecutive no-call, no-show absences in the days prior to his discharge. Before that claimant had received three written warnings during his short course of employment.

Claimant was absent without proper notification on at least five occasions prior to the final string of absences that led to his discharge. He was warned that his attendance must improve and that future occurrences may result in discharge.

Claimant did not report back to employer until January 25, 2022. He called Ms. Drinovsky at that time and asked to have his job back. Ms. Drinovsky offered to re-hire claimant if he would re-apply for the position. Claimant did not subsequently re-apply for the position despite being told he would be re-hired if he did so.

The administrative record shows claimant has received weekly benefits in the amount of \$509.00 for the week ending February 5, 2022. A fact-finding interview was set for February 17, 2022 at 10:20 a.m. The administrative record shows employer's representative provided Ms. Drinovsky's number to IWD so she could participate in the fact-finding interview. However, Ms. Drinovsky did not receive a call to participate in a fact-finding interview prior to the decision being issued.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons set forth below, the decision dated February 18, 2022 (reference 01) that allowed unemployment insurance benefits based on a finding that claimant was dismissed from work on January 6, 2022 without a showing of misconduct is REVERSED.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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 provides in relevant part:

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(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 employer bears the burden of proving that a claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits because of substantial misconduct within the meaning of Iowa Code section 96.5(2). *Myers v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 462 N.W.2d 734, 737 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. When based on carelessness, the carelessness must actually indicate a "wrongful intent" to be disqualifying in nature. *Newman, Id.* 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. *Newman, Id.*

When reviewing an alleged act of misconduct, the finder of fact may consider past acts of misconduct to determine the magnitude of the current act. *Kelly v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 386 N.W.2d 552, 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 1986). However, conduct asserted to be disqualifying misconduct must be both specific and current. *West v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 489 N.W.2d 731 (Iowa 1992); *Greene v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 426 N.W.2d 659 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Because our unemployment compensation law is designed to protect workers from financial hardships when they become unemployed through no fault of their own, we construe the provisions "liberally to carry out its humane and beneficial purpose." *Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 570 N.W.2d 85, 96 (Iowa 1997). "[C]ode provisions which operate to work a forfeiture of benefits are strongly construed in favor of the claimant." *Diggs v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 478 N.W.2d 432, 434 (Iowa Ct. App. 1991).

In order to show misconduct due to absenteeism, the employer must establish the claimant had excessive absences that were unexcused. Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness or injury cannot constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7); *Cosper, supra*; *Gaborit v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 734 N.W.2d 554 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007).

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 Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984).

Thus, the first step in the analysis is to determine whether the absences were unexcused. The requirement of “unexcused” can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for “reasonable grounds,” *Higgins* at 191, or because it was not “properly reported,” holding excused absences are those “with appropriate notice.” *Cosper* at 10. Absences due to properly reported illness are excused, 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. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871- 24.32(7); *Cosper, supra*; *Gaborit v. Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 734 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. *Gaborit, supra*. Absences related to issues of personal responsibility such as transportation, lack of childcare, and oversleeping are not considered excused. *Higgins, supra*. However, a good faith inability to obtain childcare for a sick infant may be excused. *McCourtney v. Imprimis Tech., Inc.*, 465 N.W.2d 721 (Minn. Ct. App. 1991).

The second step in the analysis is to determine whether the unexcused absences were excessive. Excessive absenteeism has been found when there have been seven unexcused absences in five months; five unexcused absences and three instances of tardiness in eight months; three unexcused absences over an eight-month period; three unexcused absences over seven months; and missing three times after being warned. *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 192 (Iowa 1984); *Infante v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984); *Armel v. EAB*, 2007 WL 3376929*3 (Iowa App. Nov. 15, 2007); *Hiland v. EAB*, No. 12-2300 (Iowa App. July 10, 2013); and *Clark v. Iowa Dep’t of Job Serv.*, 317 N.W.2d 517 (Iowa App. 1982). Excessiveness by its definition implies an amount or degree too great to be reasonable or acceptable.

It is the duty of the administrative law judge, as the trier of fact in this case, to determine the credibility of witnesses, weigh the evidence and decide the facts in issue. *Arndt v. City of LeClaire*, 728 N.W.2d 389, 394-395 (Iowa 2007). The administrative law judge may believe all, part or none of any witness’s testimony. *State v. Holtz*, 548 N.W.2d 162, 163 (Iowa App. 1996). In assessing the credibility of witnesses, the administrative law judge should consider the evidence using his or her own observations, common sense and experience. *Id.* In determining the facts, and deciding what testimony to believe, the fact finder may consider the following factors: whether the testimony is reasonable and consistent with other believable evidence; whether a witness has made inconsistent statements; the witness’s appearance, conduct, age, intelligence, memory and knowledge of the facts; and the witness’s interest in the trial, their motive, candor, bias and prejudice. *Id.*

The administrative law judge did not find claimant’s testimony regarding the reporting of his absences to be credible. Claimant testified that he was in contact with Sonny during the period he was absent. However when asked if he had records of the calls to Sonny he stated that he did not because his phone broke and he got a new one with a different number approximately six weeks ago.

Claimant called into the hearing from the same number that he provided when he opened his claim for benefits effective January 30, 2022, approximately ten weeks ago rather than six weeks

ago. This means that claimant would have had to have broken his old phone and obtained a new phone almost immediately prior to filing his claim for benefits, as he was supposedly calling in to Sonny on the prior phone with a different number as recently as mid-January 2022. It would be extremely coincidental for claimant's prior phone to break and for the evidence of those alleged phone calls to be lost within that short window of time.

It is also difficult to believe that either Sonny or Ms. Drinovsky would be dishonest about claimant's reporting of his absences. There is no apparent motive for them to do so. If anything, it seems employer was bending over backward to keep claimant employed. It allowed him to continue working even after five prior unexcused absences. And Ms. Drinovsky even offered to hire him back even after his extended unreported absence.

For the reasons set forth above and because Ms. Drinovsky presented credible and consistent testimony the administrative law judge finds it much more likely that claimant, for whatever reason, did not properly report his nearly three-week absence from employer. Factual findings were made accordingly.

Employer has carried its burden of proving claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits because of a current act of substantial misconduct within the meaning of Iowa Code section 96.5(2). Claimant had numerous unexcused absences during the course of his short time with employer, including four immediately prior to discharge. Benefits are denied effective with the date of separation.

- II. Was the claimant overpaid benefits? Should claimant repay benefits and/or charge employer due to employer participation in fact finding?

Iowa Code section 96.3(7) provides, in pertinent part:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

The administrative record shows claimant has received weekly benefits in the amount of \$509.00 for the week ending February 5, 2022. Because the administrative law judge now finds claimant disqualified from benefits he has been overpaid in that amount.

Because employer failed to participate in the fact-finding interview within the meaning of Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 and the overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment, benefits shall not be recovered from claimant. However, because employer's failure to participate was due to no fault of its own, neither shall employer's account be charged for benefits paid. The overpayment shall be absorbed by the unemployment insurance fund.


DECISION:

The decision dated February 18, 2022 (reference 01) that allowed unemployment insurance benefits based on a finding that claimant was dismissed from work on January 6, 2022 without a showing of misconduct is REVERSED. Claimant's separation from employment was disqualifying. Benefits must be denied, and employer's account shall not be charged. This disqualification shall continue until claimant has earned wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount.

Claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$509.00. Benefits shall not be recovered and employer shall not be charged. The overpayment shall be absorbed by the fund.

REMAND:

The issue of whether claimant is able to and available for work and failed to apply for or accept an offer of suitable employment is REMANDED to the Benefits Bureau of IWD for a fact-finding investigation and determination.



Andrew B. Duffelmeyer
Administrative Law Judge

April 13, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

abd/abd