

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

LINDA K COOK

Claimant,

and

SWAN HOME HEALTH LLC

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 14B-UI-12044

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-A, 24.32-7

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. Two members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. Those members are not in agreement. Cloyd (Robby) Robinson would affirm and Monique F. Kuester would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge.

Since there is not agreement, the decision of the administrative law judge is affirmed by operation of law. The Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law of the administrative law judge are adopted by the Board and that decision is **AFFIRMED** by operation of law.

486 IAC 3.3(3) provides:

Appeal board decisions. A quorum of two members of the appeal board must be present when any decision is made by the appeal board. Should there be only two members present and those two members cannot agree upon the decision, the case shall be issued as a split decision and the decision of the administrative law judge shall be affirmed by operation of law.

Cloyd (Robby) Robinson

DISSENTING OPINION OF MONIQUE F. KUESTER:

I respectfully dissent from the decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge. I would find that the Claimant had a history of unexcused absences. And while this may have been an isolated instance of no call/no show, the Claimant nonetheless violated company policy that specifically addressed this type of absence for which she had full knowledge. Though not a voluntary quit, I would conclude this final attendance infraction to be akin to another unexcused absence for which given her history should be considered excessive and disqualifying misconduct.

Monique F. Kuester

AMG/fnv