

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**TIMOTHY O FREDERICK**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-01648-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**RENT A CENTER INC  
RENT A CENTER EAST INC**  
Employer

**OC: 12/14/08 R: 04  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the February 2, 2009, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on February 26, 2009. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Andrew Majetic and was represented by Connie Hickerson of TALX UC Express. Employer's Exhibit 1 was received.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant most recently worked full-time as a manager and was employed from May 4, 2005 until December 15, 2008 when he was discharged. He was last absent on December 13 due to reported illness (flu-like symptoms). The last three warnings were presented at the time of separation. At no time did employer advise claimant that medical documentation was required and even had employer received medical documentation for the final absence it would not have changed the decision to discharge.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 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.

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 Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. In the case of an illness, it would seem reasonable that employer would not want an employee to report to work if they are at risk of infecting other employees or customers. Certainly, an employee who is ill or injured is not able to perform their job at peak levels. A reported absence related to illness or injury is excused for the purpose of the Iowa Employment Security Act. An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits. In spite of employer's policy requiring a medical excuse or release to return to work for any absence related to illness, claimant's absence was excused. While claimant certainly had poor attendance because the final absence for which he was discharged was related to properly reported illness or injury, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism has been established and no disqualification is imposed.

**DECISION:**

The February 2, 2009, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css