

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**STEVO CAKIC
APT 3
133 BROOKE RIDGE DR
WATERLOO IA 50702-5717**

**TYSON FRESH MEATS
C/o TALX UCM SERVICES
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283**

**Appeal Number: 06A-UI-03347-H2T
OC: 02-19-06 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, 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 the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

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.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. 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.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the March 20, 2006, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on April 13, 2006. The claimant did participate through the interpretation of Zijo Suceska. The employer did participate through Jim Hook, Complex Human Resources Manager. Employer's Exhibit One was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed as a line foot saw operator full time beginning July 10, 2001 through February 15, 2006, when he was discharged.

The claimant gave his wife a doctor's note to turn into the employer that indicated he had permission to be off work from February 6 through February 13. The claimant was seen by his doctor on February 8. The claimant was to be at work on February 6 and February 7. The employer checked with the doctor's office and received from the doctor a copy of the note that had been given to the claimant. The note received from the doctor's office clearly indicates that the claimant was granted permission to be off work from February 8 through February 13. The claimant caused an altered doctor's note to be submitted to the employer.

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 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 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(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 Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has a right to expect employees to submit non-altered doctor's notes. The claimant submitted a doctor's note to cover his absences from work that were not excused. While the claimant may not have submitted the note himself, he caused an altered note to be

submitted to benefit himself to cover absences that would not have been excused. Submission of the altered note is misconduct sufficient to disqualify him from receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The March 20, 2006, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to 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.

tkh/kkf