

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DANNY L TSCHUDIN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-04789-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OMAHA STANDARD INC
Employer

OC: 03/31/13
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Danny Tschudin (claimant) appealed a representative's April 16, 2013 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Omaha Standard (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for May 29, 2013. The claimant participated personally. The employer was represented by Tom Kuiper, Hearings Representative, and participated by Karen Biggs, Human Resources Manager.

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 July 14, 1994, as a full-time unloader. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook. He signed for the employer's attendance policy on June 1, 2012. The attendance policy states that an employee will receive a written warning if he is absent a total of 24 hours, a final written warning if he is absent a total of 32 hours, and an employee is terminated if he is absent 48 hours in a year. The annual period begins on June 1. The employer issued the claimant a written warning on January 31, 2013, and a final written warning on February 4, 2013. The employer notified the claimant that further infractions could result in termination from employment. From June 1, 2012, through March 25, 2013, the claimant was tardy for work 40 times, usually because he had trouble getting going in the morning. He left early 13 times to take care of personal business. Twice he accidentally took a long lunch. On March 26, 2013, he overslept and was more than two hours late without calling to report his absence. The employer terminated the claimant on March 26, 2013.

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:

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(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).

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 and the final absence was not excused. The final absence, in combination with the claimant's history of unexcused absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are withheld.

DECISION:

The representative's April 16, 2013 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. 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.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs