

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**CLINT R MILLER
723 G AVE NW
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52405-2616**

**ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND CO
% TALX UCM SERVICES INC
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283**

APPEAL 21A-UI-24085-JC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

REQUEST TO REOPEN AND APPEAL RIGHTS:

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the mailing date below the administrative law judge's signature on the last page of the decision, you or any interested party:

Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to:

**Employment Appeal Board
4th Floor – Lucas Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
or
Fax (515)281-7191
Online: eab.iowa.gov**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:

The name, address and social security number of the claimant.

A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.

That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.

The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

SERVICE INFORMATION:

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.

ONLINE RESOURCES:

UI law and administrative rules:

<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-law-and-administrative-rules>

UI Benefits Handbook:

<https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-claimant-handbook>

Employer UI Handbook: <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/employer-handbook>

Report UI fraud: <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/report-fraud>

Employer account access and information: <https://www.myiowaui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/>

National Career Readiness Certificate and Skilled Iowa Initiative: <http://skillediowa.org/>

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

CLINT R MILLER
Claimant

ARCHER DANIELS MIDLAND CO
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-24085-JC-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 09/26/21
Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(7) – Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism
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:

The employer/appellant, Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., filed an appeal from the October 19, 2021 (reference 01) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on January 6, 2021. The claimant/respondent, Clint R. Miller, did not participate. The employer participated through Patricia Cash.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. Employer Exhibit 1 was admitted. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?
Can any charges to the employer’s account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as an Operator 2 beginning November 2013 and was separated from employment on July 19, 2021, when he was discharged.

Claimant was trained on employer’s policy during employment, which included notifying employer thirty minutes prior of an unplanned absence or tardy. Employer has issued claimant seventeen attendance warnings during his employment. Employer discharged claimant after having three (non-consecutive) no call/no shows, per its policy. Employer considers an

absence that is reported after the start time to be a no-call/no show. Employer considered the following occurrences when deciding to discharge claimant:

On July 18, 2020, claimant called at 9:04 p.m. to report he would be absent for his shift that began at 6:00 p.m. and wanted to use a personal day.

On September 12, 2020, claimant was absent for unknown reasons.

On April 14, 2021, claimant was a no call/no show (Employer Exhibit 1).

On April 23, 2021, claimant was tardy, reason unknown. Claimant received a final written warning (Employer Exhibit 1).

On July 16, 2021, claimant called off late, after his start time, to report his absence. Because the call off occurred after his start time, he was considered a no call/no show. No evidence was presented that claimant was incapable of calling off sooner. He was subsequently discharged.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has not received unemployment benefits since establishing his claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective September 26, 2021.

The administrative record also establishes that the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview or make a witness with direct knowledge available for rebuttal. On the day of the fact-finding interview, employer received a phone call from an IWD representative saying the fact-finder was running behind and they would be called back. Employer did not receive a call back.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa unemployment insurance law disqualifies individuals who are discharged from employment for misconduct from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a. They remain disqualified until such time as they requalify for benefits by working and earning insured wages ten times their weekly benefit amount. *Id.*

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a provides:

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).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. 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). Absences due to illness or injury must be properly reported in order to be excused. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

In the specific context of absenteeism the administrative code provides:

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.

871 IAC 24.32(7); See *Higgins v. IDJS*, 350 N.W.2d 187, 190 n. 1 (Iowa 1984) ("rule [2]4.32(7)...accurately states the law").

The requirements for a finding of misconduct based on absences are therefore twofold. First, the absences must be unexcused. *Cosper v. IDJS*, 321 N.W.2d 6, 10 (Iowa 1982). Second, the unexcused absences must be excessive. *Sallis v. Employment Appeal Bd*, 437 N.W.2d 895, 897 (Iowa 1989). The administrative law judge is persuaded the claimant was aware of the employer's policies which required claimant to notify employer of his absences prior to his shift. Employer stated claimant had seventeen warnings about attendance in approximately six years of employment. Claimant most recently was issued a final warning on April 23, 2021. Claimant was then absent and did not notify his employer until after his shift. An employer has the right to expect employees to show up to their assigned shifts, or alternately provide proper notice if unable to work. Claimant did not attend the hearing to refute the employer's evidence. No evidence was presented that claimant's improper notification was due to extenuating circumstances. Therefore, regardless of the reason for claimant's final absence, because it was not properly reported, it is considered unexcused.

Based on the evidence presented, the employer has credibly established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

Overpayment and relief of charges

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b provides:

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 § 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(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 § 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.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this states pursuant to § 602.10101.

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.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were originally allowed. However, he did not receive any benefits and therefore there is no overpayment in accordance with Iowa Code § 96.3(7).

The administrative law judge further concludes the employer did not satisfactorily participate in the fact-finding interview pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10. The law states that an employer is to be charged if "the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits." Iowa Code § 96.3(7)(b)(1)(a).

Here, the employer did not receive a phone call from IWD to participate in the fact-finding interview. Benefits were not allowed because the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to IWD's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. Instead, benefits were allowed because the employer did not receive proper opportunity to participate in the fact-finding interview. Employer thus cannot be charged. Since neither party is to be charged, any potential charges for this claim should be absorbed by the fund. (The issue is moot at this time inasmuch as claimant has not been paid benefits).

DECISION:

The October 19, 2021 (reference 01) initial decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. There is no overpayment of benefits. The employer's account is relieved of charges.



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

February 7, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/mh

NOTE TO CLAIMANT:

This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.

You may find information about food, housing, and other resources at <https://covidrecoveryiowa.org/> or at <https://dhs.iowa.gov/node/3250>

Iowa Finance Authority also has additional resources at <https://www.iowafinance.com/about/covid-19-ifa-recovery-assistance/>