

**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**

**MARY M SHIELD
707 W 9TH ST LOT 37
TIPTON IA 52772**

**COMMUNICATIONS DATA SERVICE INC
ATTENTION: HUMAN RESOURCES
PO BOX 671
DES MOINES IA 50303**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-11778-S2T
OC: 10/23/05 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (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 for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Communications Data Service (employer) appealed a representative's November 10, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded Mary Shield (claimant) was discharged and there was no evidence of willful or deliberate misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on December 6, 2005. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Floyd Schrodt, Warehouse Manager, and Jim Stewart, Warehouse Supervisor. The employer offered one exhibit which was marked for identification as Exhibit One. Exhibit One was received into evidence.

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 November 29, 2004, as a full-time Material Handler 2. The claimant understood she had to swipe her time card at the beginning of her shift. On June 23, 2005, the employer issued the claimant a verbal warning for failure to swipe her card. The claimant thought there might be something wrong with the card and notified the employer. After the warning she was careful to always scan her card. The claimant was unaware whether the employer took any action to fix the card or reader. On July 27, 2005, the employer issued the claimant a verbal warning for excessive absences. After this warning the claimant obtained an excuse from her physician for all absences.

On August 30, 2005, the employer issued the claimant a warning for failure to swipe her card 19 times. The claimant was shocked that the employer did not say anything to her earlier. She told the employer that something was wrong with the scanning process. On September 15, 2005, the employer issued the claimant a written warning for absenteeism even though all the claimant's absences were for illness, properly reported and had a doctor's excuse.

On October 21, 2005, the claimant scanned her card but the reader did not record her swipe. On October 24, 2005, the employer terminated the claimant for failure to swipe her card at the beginning of her shift and for excessive absenteeism.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct. For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes she 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. All of the claimant's last absences were properly reported illness and had doctor's excuses. The claimant's absences do not amount to job misconduct because they were properly reported.

In addition, the claimant scanned her card on October 20, 2005, but the reader did not record it. The employer has failed to provide any evidence of willful and deliberate misconduct that would be a final incident leading to the discharge. The claimant was discharged but there was no misconduct.

DECISION:

The representative's November 10, 2005 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

bas/s