

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

ELIZABETH J JOHNSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 19A-UI-00377-S1-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

RS HANLINE AND COMPANY INC
Employer

**OC: 12/09/18
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

RS Hanline and Company (employer) appealed a representative's January 9, 2019, decision (reference 04) that concluded Elizabeth Johnson (claimant) was eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for January 30, 2019. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Karyn Goldensoph, Human Resources Generalist. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

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 hired on January 8, 2018. She signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on January 8, 2018. The attendance policy stated that an employee may be terminated if she accumulated ten attendance points in a calendar year.

On April 9, 2018, the employer talked to the claimant about her attendance and presented her with a progressive disciplinary action to sign. The document indicated she had 4.5 attendance points. The document stated that the claimant had three call offs, one tardy, and two early outs. The employer's records showed that the claimant was absent due to illness twice. She was absent once because her four-year-old twins were sick. The claimant was tardy once because her eleven-year-old daughter's school bus was late. The claimant had not left work early. The employer's records indicated she was an absent without report on March 31, 2018. This was not reflected on the warning and the claimant had no knowledge of the situation. Without the absent without report, the claimant's point total was 3.5. All of the absences were properly reported. The employer did not give the claimant a copy of the document. The employer did not notify the claimant she could be terminated for further absences.

On April 9, 2018, the employer issued the claimant a written warning and three-day suspension for her attendance. The document indicated she had nine attendance points. The document stated that the claimant had five call offs, one tardy, and seven early outs. In addition to the earlier absences, the employer's records showed that the claimant was absent due to illness two additional days. She left work early because she was sick three times. The claimant's point total added up to 6.5 without the absent without report. All of the absences were properly reported. The employer did not give the claimant a copy of the document. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment.

On October 1, 2018, the claimant was late in reporting to work because she was ill. Her absence was properly reported. She asked to leave work early and went to her physician. She provided a doctor's note to the employer for her absence on October 1, 2018. The employer excused her absence when she left early but assessed her .5 attendance points for her tardiness due to properly reported illness.

The claimant moved and had to walk twenty-five minutes to work. A portion of the way she walked with her daughter. She was late in arriving to work on October 3, 31, and November 5, 2018. She properly reported each time and accumulated a total of 1.5 attendance points. On October 31, 2018, the claimant became a full-time quality control worker in training and her work hours started fifteen minutes earlier for that day and for November 13, 2018. On November 13, 2018, the claimant properly reported her late arrival for work and received .5 attendance points. When she reached work, the employer sent her home. On November 14, 2018, the employer terminated the claimant for attendance issues. The employer determined the claimant accrued 12.5 attendance points.

The claimant filed for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of December 9, 2018. She received \$2,051.00 in benefits after the separation from employment. The employer provided the name and number of Zachary Miller as the person who would participate in the fact-finding interview on January 8, 2019. The fact finder called Mr. Miller, but he was not available. The fact finder left a voice message with the fact finder's name, number, and the employer's appeal rights. The employer did not respond to the message.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

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.

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 Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. 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 incidents of absence on March 14, April 7, May 5, June 26, 28, 30, July 5, and September 1, 2018, were for properly reported illness. These absences do not amount to job misconduct because they were properly reported.

This leaves the absence on January 17, 2018, when the claimant’s four-year-old twins were sick and five incidents of tardiness. An employer is entitled to expect its employees to report to work as scheduled or to be notified when and why the employee is unable to report to work. The employer has established that the claimant was warned that further unexcused absences could result in termination of employment. The repeated tardiness, including the final tardy was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant’s history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer’s account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b.

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.

The employer did not meaningfully participate in the fact finding interview and is chargeable. The claimant's overpayment is waived.

DECISION:

The representative's January 9, 2019, decision (reference 04) is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

The employer did not meaningfully participate in the fact finding interview and is chargeable. The claimant's overpayment is waived.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/rvs