

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

RICHARD A PRAZAK
Claimant

IOWA MOLD TOOLING CO INC
Employer

APPEAL 19A-UI-01564-AW-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 01/27/19
Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2) – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – DM – Excessive unexcused absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Richard Prazak, Claimant, filed an appeal from the February 13, 2019 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits because he was discharged from work with Iowa Mold Tooling Co. due to violation of a known company rule. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 7, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. Claimant participated. Employer did not participate. No exhibits were admitted.

ISSUE:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge due to disqualifying job-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

As claimant was the only witness, the administrative law judge makes the following findings of fact based solely upon claimant's testimony: Claimant was employed full-time as a welder from December 8, 2008 until his employment with Iowa Mold Tooling Co., Inc. ended on January 22, 2019. Claimant's direct supervisor was Josh Erdman. Claimant's schedule was Monday through Thursday from 4:30 p.m. until 3:00 a.m. On January 22, 2019, employer discharged claimant for absenteeism according to its point-based attendance policy. Claimant's last absence was on January 18, 2019. Claimant informed employer of his absence prior to the beginning of his shift on January 18, 2019 pursuant to employer's attendance policy. Claimant's absence was due to a family emergency.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

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 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(1)(a) provides:

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 of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct*. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

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).

Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore twofold. First, the absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895 (Iowa 1989). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 192 (Iowa 1984). Second, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10. The requirement of "unexcused" can be satisfied in two ways. An absence can be unexcused either because it was not for "reasonable grounds," *Higgins*, 350 N.W.2d at 191, or because it was not "properly reported," holding excused absences are those "with appropriate notice." *Cosper*, 321 N.W.2d at 10. An employer's no-fault absenteeism policy or point system is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for unemployment insurance benefits.

Claimant's absence on January 18, 2019 was for reasonable grounds and was properly reported. Therefore, the absence was excused and is not misconduct. Without a current or final act of misconduct, the history of other incidents need not be examined. Employer has not met its burden of proving disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The February 13, 2019 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. Benefits are allowed provided claimant is otherwise eligible.

Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50319-0209
Fax: 515-478-3528

Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/rvs