

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TIMOTHY TAGGE
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-12028-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE SYSTEM INC
Employer

OC: 08/14/11
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) - Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Fedex Ground Package System, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated September 9, 2011, reference 01, which held that Timothy Tagge (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on October 6, 2011. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Steve Nelson, senior manager. Employer's Exhibits One through Three were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a part-time package handler from January 15, 2009 through August 16, 2011, when he was discharged for violation of the attendance policy. The employer's attendance policy provides for termination if an employee had three unapproved absences with a 30-day period. Employees are given a verbal for the first unexcused absence and a written warning for the second one.

The claimant received numerous attendance warnings. Warnings were issued to him on October 9, November 4, and December 3, 2010. Additional warnings were issued to him on January 14, January 22, February 19, April 6, April 16, and May 14, 2011. Most of the claimant's absences were due to properly reported illness. The first of the final three absences, which was due to properly reported illness occurred on July 22, 2011, and the claimant received a verbal warning. The second unexcused absence occurred on July 23, 2011 when the claimant missed work due to transportation problems, and he received the written warning on

July 26, 2011. The final absence on August 16, 2011, which prompted the termination, was due to properly reported illness.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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.

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984). The claimant was discharged on August 16, 2011 for excessive unexcused absenteeism.

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 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).

Excessive unexcused absenteeism, a concept which includes tardiness, is misconduct. *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984). 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 claimant’s final absence was due to properly reported illness and is therefore not considered misconduct under the unemployment insurance laws. Because the final absence for which he was discharged was related to properly reported illness or injury, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism has been established and no disqualification is imposed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated September 9, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw