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

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-00876-S2T
OC: 12/14/03 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (2)

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.

LUIS G CAUTINO
2868 CORAL CT #203
CORALVILLE IA 52241

SEATON CORPORATION
C/O KRAFT STAFF MANAGEMENT
C/O GATES UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 182366
COLUMBUS OH 43218

ROSIE PARAMO-RICOY
INTERPRETER
4316 GRAND AVE #7
DES MOINES IA 50312

_____
(Administrative Law Judge)

_____
(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Luis Cautino (claimant) appealed a representative's January 21, 2004 decision (reference 02) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Seaton Corporation (employer) for excessive absenteeism after being warned. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on February 19, 2004. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Susan Murphy, Account Supervisor.

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 June 29, 2002, as a full-time temporary production worker assigned to Proctor and Gamble. The claimant received a copy of the employer's attendance policy and signed for its receipt on June 6, 2002.

The claimant received warnings on February 13 and July 2, 2003, concerning his job performance. The claimant could not work quickly because he suffered from a disability. On September 7 and 9, 2003, the claimant received warnings due to poor attendance 90 percent of the claimant's absences were due to his own illness. The remainder were due to transportation and babysitting problems.

The claimant was absent on December 14, 2003, due to illness. He spent the morning in the emergency room. Prior to the start of his shift the claimant left a message for the employer concerning his absence. The employer did not remember receiving the message. The employer terminated the claimant on December 15, 2003.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes he was 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.

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).

871 IAC 24.32(8) provides:

> (8) Past acts of misconduct. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

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 employer must establish not only misconduct but that there was a final incident of misconduct which precipitated the discharge. The last incident of absence was a properly reported illness which occurred on December 14, 2003. The claimant's absence does not amount to job misconduct because it was properly reported. The employer has failed to provide any evidence of willful and deliberate misconduct which was the final incident leading to the discharge. The claimant was discharged but there was no misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's January 21, 2004 decision (reference 02) is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

bas/kjf