

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**DUANE TURNER**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-09923-NT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WAL-MART STORES INC**

Employer

**OC: 07/22/12**

**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from a representative's decision dated August 10, 2012, reference 01, which denied unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice was provided, a telephone hearing was held on September 12, 2012. The claimant participated. Although duly notified, the employer did not respond to the notice of hearing and did not participate.

**ISSUE:**

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having considered the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Duane Turner was employed by Wal-Mart Stores beginning in 1999. Mr. Turner last worked as a full-time stocker and was paid by the hour. His immediate supervisor was April (last name unknown). Mr. Turner was discharged on July 21, 2012, when he exceeded the permissible number of attendance infractions allowed under company policy.

Mr. Turner called in sick on July 18, 2012, due to what he considered to be a serious medical condition. The claimant called in over one hour prior to the beginning of the work shift in compliance with the company's call-in policies. Mr. Turner had been warned that his attendance was not satisfactory. The claimant, however, did not believe his job was in jeopardy, because he believed that two attendance infractions should have been excused and he believed that the others should have "rolled off" because one year had elapsed.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The question before the administrative law judge is whether the evidence in the record establishes willful misconduct sufficient to warrant the denial of unemployment insurance benefits. It does not.

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.

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.

The employer has the burden of proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6-2. Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Conduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee may not necessarily be serious enough to warrant the denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa App. 1992).

The Supreme Court of Iowa in the case of Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984), held that excessive unexcused absenteeism is a form of job misconduct. The Court held that the absences must both be excessive and unexcused and that the concept includes tardiness, leaving early, etc. The Court further held, however, absence due to illness and other excusable reasons are deemed excused if the employee properly notifies the employer.

Inasmuch as the evidence in the record establishes that Mr. Turner's last absence was due to illness and was properly reported, the administrative law judge concludes that the employer has not sustained its burden of proof in establishing the claimant's discharge took place for intentional misconduct sufficient to warrant the denial of unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant meets all other eligibility requirements of Iowa law.

**DECISION:**

The representative's decision dated August 10, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. Unemployment insurance benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Terence P. Nice  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

kjw/kjw