# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

PEDRO APARCANA

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-14125-LT** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

**AMERISTAR CASINO CO BLUFFS INC** 

**Employer** 

OC: 10/09/11

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the October 25, 2011 (reference 01) decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was scheduled to be held by telephone conference call on December 7, 2011. Claimant responded to the hearing notice instructions but was not available when the hearing was called. Employer opted not to participate. The decision is based upon the administrative record and proposed exhibits claimant submitted in anticipation of the hearing

## **ISSUE:**

The issue is whether claimant was discharged for reasons related to job misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of benefits.

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was separated from employment on September 1, 2011. He was discharged from employment due to a final series of absences due to surgery and recovery. His absences were excused by treating medical professionals.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

Iowa Code § 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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Excessive absences are not considered misconduct unless unexcused. Absences due to properly reported illness or injury cannot constitute job misconduct since they are not volitional. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988).

An employer may discharge an employee for any number of reasons or no reason at all if it is not contrary to public policy, but if it fails to meet its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct as the reason for the separation, employer incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation. A reported absence related to injury is excused for the purpose of the lowa Employment Security Act. An employer's point system or no-fault absenteeism policy is not dispositive of the issue of qualification for benefits. Because the final absence period for which he was discharged was related to properly reported injury and related surgery and recovery, no final or current incident of unexcused absenteeism has been established and no disqualification is imposed.

### **DECISION:**

The October 25, 2011 (reference 01) decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	

dml/kjw