IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

DEMETRICE D WELCH

Claimant

APPEAL 19A-UI-03780-CL-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SWIFT PORK COMPANY

Employer

OC: 04/21/19

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the May 9, 2019, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a separation from employment. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 29, 2019. Claimant participated. Employer did not answer at the number it provided for the hearing and did not participate.

ISSUE:

Did claimant voluntarily leave the employment with good cause attributable to the employer or did employer discharge the claimant for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on September 12, 2016. Claimant last worked as a full-time rendering cooker specialist. Claimant was separated from employment on April 22, 2019, when he was discharged.

Claimant worked on April 12, 2019. Claimant became ill and notified his supervisor he needed to leave work early. Claimant left early. Claimant saw a medical provider and was given a note excusing him from work from April 12 through 14, 2019.

Claimant appeared for work on April 15, 2019. During the shift, employer brought claimant in for a meeting to consider administering discipline for leaving early on April 12, 2019. Claimant felt employer was treating him more harshly because of his race. Claimant brought this up to his union representative, who agreed claimant was being mistreated. Claimant did not have the opportunity to present his doctor's note to employer on April 15, 2019.

Claimant appeared at the workplace on April 16, 2019, to present his doctor's note. The guard at the guard shack would not let claimant through the gate. Claimant called employer's attendance line and stated he would be absent for personal reasons. Claimant's personal

reason was that he felt he was being mistreated by employer and was not going to return to work until the issues were worked out between employer and claimant's union representative.

Claimant was absent for the remainder of his employment for the same personal reason. Each day he was scheduled to work, claimant reported his absence.

On April 26, 2019, employer sent claimant a letter informing him he was terminated effective April 22, 2019, due to no-call/no-show absences for three consecutive days.

Claimant had never been previously disciplined for attendance issues.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue is whether claimant resigned or was discharged by employer. The employer has the burden to establish the separation was a voluntary quitting of employment rather than a discharge. Iowa Code § 96.6(2).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(4) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. 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. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to lowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving lowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(4) The claimant was absent for three days without giving notice to employer in violation of company rule.

In this case, the evidence shows claimant was absent for three consecutive days, but reported those absences. Therefore, employer did not establish claimant resigned. Claimant was discharged.

A claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment benefits if the employer discharged the individual for misconduct in connection with the claimant's employment. Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a. 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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). 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).

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 term "absenteeism" also encompasses conduct that is more accurately referred to as "tardiness." *Higgins v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190 (Iowa 1984).

In order to show misconduct due to absenteeism, the employer must establish the claimant had excessive absences that were unexcused. 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. The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. Higgins at 192.

Inasmuch as employer had not previously warned claimant about the issue leading to the separation, it has not met the burden of proof to establish that claimant acted deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. An employee is entitled to fair warning that the employer will no longer tolerate certain performance and conduct. Without fair warning, an employee has no reasonable way of knowing that there are changes that need be made in order to preserve the employment. If an employer expects an employee to conform to certain expectations or face discharge, appropriate (preferably written), detailed, and reasonable notice should be given.

DECISION:

The May 9, 2019, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. Benefits withheld based upon this separation shall be paid to claimant.

Christine A. Louis
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/scn