

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

STEVE GOOD
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 13A-UI-08912-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MENARD INC
Employer

OC: 07/07/13
Claimant: Respondent (2/R)

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct
871 IAC 24.32(7) - Excessive Unexcused Absenteeism
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Menard, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated July 25, 2013, reference 01, which held that Steve Good (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 September 9, 2013. The claimant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which he could be contacted, and therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Mike Whittaker, Warranty Center Manager and Bob Rankin, Assistant General Manager. Employer's Exhibits One through Three were admitted into evidence.

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 considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed full-time from November 26, 2007 through March 12, 2013 and was most recently working as a supervisor. He was discharged from employment due to violation of the employer's attendance policy with a final incident on March 7, 2013 when he was a no-call/no-show. The employer's attendance policy provides for a written warning if an employee accumulates one to eight points, a suspension at nine points and termination at ten points. The claimant was last warned on February 25, 2013, that he faced termination if he accumulated three more attendance points. From April 15, 2012 through the date of termination, the claimant was suspended twice and received 23 written warnings. Most of his unexcused absences were due to tardiness.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective July 7, 2013 and has received benefits after the separation from employment.

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. 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. 871 IAC 24.32(1).

The employer has the burden to prove the discharged employee is disqualified for benefits due to work-related misconduct. *Sallis v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895, 896 (Iowa 1989). The claimant was discharged on March 12, 2013 for 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. 871 IAC 24.32(7).

The Iowa Supreme Court in the case of *Higgins v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 187 (Iowa 1984) held that excessive unexcused absenteeism is a form of misconduct and includes tardiness, leaving early, etc. The Court in the case of *Harlan v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 350 N.W.2d 192 (Iowa 1984) held that absences due to matters of "personal responsibility such as transportation problems and oversleeping are considered to be unexcused."

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 absenteeism, is considered excessive. Benefits are denied.

The unemployment insurance law requires benefits be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later denied benefits even if the claimant acted in good faith and was not at fault. However, a claimant will not have to repay an overpayment when an initial decision to award benefits on an employment separation issue is reversed on appeal if two conditions are met: (1) the claimant did not receive the benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation, and (2) the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding that awarded benefits. In addition, if a claimant is not required to repay an overpayment because the employer failed to participate in the initial proceeding, the employer's account will be charged for the overpaid benefits. Iowa Code § 96.3-7-a, -b.

The matter of deciding the amount of the overpayment and whether the amount overpaid should be recovered from the claimant and charged to the employer under Iowa Code § 96.3-7-b is remanded to the Agency.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated July 25, 2013, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The matter is remanded to the Claims Section for investigation and determination of the overpayment issue.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css