IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

TRACY REESE

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 13A-UI-04151-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

DECISION

PACKERS SANITATION SERVICES INC

Employer

OC: 03/03/13

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct 871 IAC 24.32(7) - Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Tracy Reese (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated March 29, 2013, reference 02, which held that she was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from Packers Sanitation Services, Inc. (employer) for work-related misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 14, 2013. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Eric Jackson, Site Manager. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time laborer from June 6, 2012 through March 8, 2013 when she was discharged for excessive absenteeism. She had approximately 18 absences and all but three were due to properly reported medical reasons. The claimant had doctors' excuses for most of her absences. She was discharged without any prior warnings.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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(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.

The employer has the burden to prove the discharged employee is disqualified for benefits for misconduct. *Sallis v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895, 896 (lowa 1989). 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).

Excessive unexcused absenteeism, a concept which includes tardiness, is misconduct. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). The determination of whether unexcused absenteeism is excessive necessarily requires consideration of past acts and warnings. *Id.* No previous warnings were issued and the claimant did have 18 absences, but the majority of these were due to properly reported medical reasons for which she had doctors' notes. Excessive absences are not misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness can never constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The employer has not met its burden. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has not been established in this case and benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated March 29, 2013, reference 02, is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Susan D. Ackerman Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css