

**- DECISION -**

Claimant:	Decision No.:	2043-BR-13
MARLON S FRANCOIS	Date:	July 22, 2013
	Appeal No.:	1242065
	S.S. No.:	
Employer:	L.O. No.:	61
CHALLENGER TRANSPORTATION INC	Appellant:	Employer

Issue: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct or gross misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of Maryland Code, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 8-1002 or 1003.

---

**- NOTICE OF RIGHT OF APPEAL TO COURT -**

You may file an appeal from this decision in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City or one of the Circuit Courts in a county in Maryland. The court rules about how to file the appeal can be found in many public libraries, in the Maryland Rules of Procedure, Title 7, Chapter 200.

The period for filing an appeal expires: August 21, 2013

---

**REVIEW OF THE RECORD**

After a review of the record, the Board adopts the following findings of fact and conclusions of law and reverses the hearing examiner's decision.

The employer had a policy which provides that any employee exceeding ten points within a twelve month period would be subject to termination. The claimant received a copy of the policy.

The claimant was discharged for repeated absences, tardiness and insubordination. The claimant received verbal and written warnings for his violations of company policies. The claimant was given a written warning that there were be serious consequences for another incident

On November 14<sup>th</sup>, the claimant was a no call/no show for work. On November 15<sup>th</sup>, the claimant reported to work late and presented a return to work certificate for his absence from the day before. However, questions were raised about the authenticity of the return to work certificate due to areas of apparent white out. The claimant was, then, discharged.

The General Assembly declared that, in its considered judgment, the public good and the general welfare of the citizens of the State required the enactment of the Unemployment Insurance Law, under the police powers of the State, for the compulsory setting aside of unemployment reserves to be used for the benefit of individuals unemployed through no fault of their own. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-102(c)*. Unemployment compensation laws are to be read liberally in favor of eligibility, and disqualification provisions are to be strictly construed. *Sinai Hosp. of Baltimore v. Dept. of Empl. & Training*, 309 Md. 28 (1987).

The Board reviews the record *de novo* and may affirm, modify, or reverse the findings of fact or conclusions of law of the hearing examiner on the basis of evidence submitted to the hearing examiner, or evidence that the Board may direct to be taken, or may remand any case to a hearing examiner for purposes it may direct. *Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. Art., § 8-510(d)*; *COMAR 09.32.06.04*. The Board fully inquires into the facts of each particular case. *COMAR 09.32.06.03(E)(1)*.

In a discharge case, the employer has the burden of demonstrating that the claimant's actions rise to the level of misconduct, gross misconduct or aggravated misconduct based upon a preponderance of the credible evidence in the record. *Hartman v. Polystyrene Products Co., Inc.*, 164-BH-83; *Ward v. Maryland Permalite, Inc.*, 30-BR-85; *Weimer v. Dept. of Transportation*, 869-BH-87; *Scruggs v. Division of Correction*, 347-BH-89; *Ivey v. Catterton Printing Co.*, 441-BH-89.

As the Court of Appeals explained in *Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation v. Hider*, 349 Md. 71, 82, 706 A.2d 1073 (1998), "in enacting the unemployment compensation program, the legislature created a graduated, three-tiered system of disqualifications from benefits based on employee misconduct. The severity of the disqualification increases in proportion to the seriousness of the misconduct."

*Dept. of Labor, Licensing & Regulation v. Boardley*, 164 Md. 404, 408 fn.1 (2005).

Section 8-1002 of the Labor and Employment Article defines gross misconduct as conduct of an employee that is a deliberate and willful disregard of standards of behavior that an employing unit rightfully expects and that shows gross indifference to the interests of the employing unit or repeated violations of employment rules that prove a regular and wanton disregard of the employee's obligations.

The term "misconduct" as used in the statute means a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, the commission of a forbidden act, a dereliction from duty, or a course of wrongful conduct committed by an employee within the scope of his employment relationship, during hours of employment or on the employer's premises, within the meaning of Section 8-1003 of the Labor and Employment Article. (*See, Rogers v. Radio Shack*, 271 Md. 126, 314 A.2d 113).

Simple misconduct within the meaning of § 8-1003 does not require intentional misbehavior. *DLLR v. Hider*, 349 Md. 71 (1998); also see *Johns Hopkins University v. Board of Labor, Licensing and Regulation*, 134 Md. App. 653, 662-63. (2000)(psychiatric condition which prevented claimant from conforming his/her conduct to accepted norms did not except that conduct from the category of misconduct under § 8-1003). Misconduct must be connected with the work; the mere fact that misconduct adversely affects the employer's interests is not enough. *Fino v. Maryland Emp. Sec. Bd.*, 218 Md. 504 (1959). Although not sufficient in itself, a breach of duty to an employer is an essential element to make an act connected with the work. *Empl. Sec. Bd. v. LeCates*, 218 Md. 202 (1958). Misconduct, however, need not occur during the hours of employment or the employer's premises. *Id.*

Without sufficient evidence of a willful and wanton disregard of an employee's obligations or gross indifference to the employer's interests, there can be no finding of gross misconduct. *Lehman v. Baker Protective Services, Inc.*, 221-BR-89. Where a showing of gross misconduct is based on a single action, the employer must show the employee demonstrated gross indifference to the employer's interests. *DLLR v. Muddiman*, 120 Md. App. 725, 737 (1998).

In determining whether an employee has committed gross misconduct, "[t]he important element to be considered is the nature of the misconduct and how seriously it affects the claimant's employment or the employer's rights." *Dept. of Econ. & Empl. Dev. v. Jones*, 79 Md. App. 531, 536 (1989). "It is also proper to note that what is 'deliberate and willful misconduct' will vary with each particular case. Here we 'are not looking simply for substandard conduct...but for a willful or wanton state of mind accompanying the engaging in substandard conduct.'" *Employment Sec. Bd. v. LeCates*, 218 Md. 202, 207 (1958)(internal citation omitted); also see *Hernandez v. DLLR*, 122 Md. App. 19, 25 (1998).

Aggravated misconduct is an amplification of gross misconduct where the claimant engages in "behavior committed with actual malice and deliberate disregard for the property, safety or life of others that...affects the employer, fellow employees, subcontractors, invitees of the employer, members of the public, or the ultimate consumer of the employer's products or services...and consists of either a physical assault or property loss so serious that the penalties of misconduct or gross misconduct are not sufficient."

The failure to follow workplace rules or procedures can constitute gross misconduct. *See, e.g. Kidwell v. Mid-Atlantic Hambro, Inc.*, 119-BH-86; *Ullman v. Anne Arundel County Public Schools*, 498-BR-93. Attendance violations may constitute gross misconduct. An employer has the right to insist that its employees report to work on time, adhere to a specified schedule and leave only when that schedule has been completed. An employee's decision to follow a come-and-go-as-I-please philosophy could clearly disrupt the orderly operation of the workplace. *Dept. of Econ. Dev. v. Propper*, 108 Md. App. 595 (1996).

Persistent and chronic absenteeism, where the absences are without notice or excuse and continue in the face of warning constitutes gross misconduct. *Watkins v. Empl. Security Admin.*, 266 Md. 223 (1972). The failure to report or call into work without notice may constitute gross misconduct. *Hardin v. Broadway Services, Inc.* 146-BR-89. Employees who miss a lot of time from work, even for excused reasons, have a heightened duty not to miss additional time for unexcused reasons and to conform with the employer's notice requirements. *Daley v. Vaccaro's Inc.*, 1432-BR-93.

A specific warning regarding termination is not required and a reasonable person should realize that such conduct leads to discharge. *Freyman v. Laurel Toyota*, 608-BR-87. A violation of an employer's attendance policy is not misconduct per se where that policy does not distinguish between absences which occurred because of legitimate medical reasons and absences for which there was no reasonable excuse. Where an employee has been absent for a day of scheduled work, the burden of proof shifts to the employee to explain the reason for the absence. *Leonard v. St. Agnes Hospital*, 62-BR-86.

A violation of an employer's attendance policy is not misconduct per se where that policy does not distinguish between absences which occurred because of legitimate medical reasons and absences for which there was no reasonable excuse.

Absenteeism due to illness is not misconduct. *DuBois v. Redden and Rizk, P.A.*, 71-BH-90(The claimant was absent from work and on maternity leave. Due to unexpected medical complications, the claimant was not able to return to work as early as anticipated. The claimant kept her employer informed of her medical condition. The employer could not hold the claimant's job until she could be able to return to work).

However, absenteeism not totally attributable to illness can be misconduct or gross misconduct. *Schools v. AMI-Sub of Prince George's County*, 932-BR-90(The claimant had an excessive number of incidents of tardiness. During his last month of employment, his lateness was due entirely to a documented medical condition. The earlier incidents were due to transportation problems. The discharge was for misconduct); *Johnson v. United States Postal Service*, 66-BR-91(The claimant missed 11 of the last 34 days of work. The claimant had been injured and her assignments were adjusted within her capabilities. The amount of absenteeism was not justified by her injury. She had been counseled about the importance of avoiding absenteeism. The discharge was for gross misconduct). Even though a claimant's last absence was with good reason, a finding of gross misconduct is supported where the claimant was discharged for a long record of absenteeism without valid excuse or notice, which persisted after warnings. *Hamel v. Coldwater Seafood Corporation*, 1227-BR-93.

In the instant case, the employer had an attendance policy which provides that any employee exceeding ten points within a twelve month period would be subject to termination. Employees who miss a lot of time, even for excused reasons have a heightened duty not to miss additional time for unexcused reasons and to conform to the employer's notice requirements. *Daley v. Vaccaro's, Inc.* 1432-BR-93.

The claimant demonstrated a pattern of tardiness and absenteeism. This pattern continued after verbal and written warnings. In March, after being absent the day before, the claimant was late to work and provided a medical return to work certificate, which was questionable.

In a letter to the claimant dated March 27, 2012, the Board requested original documentation for the claimant's absences due to illness. As of the date of this decision, the Board has not received any further communication from the claimant.

The credible evidence established that the claimant's actions showed a deliberate and willful disregard of the standards the employer has the right to expect.

The Board notes that the hearing examiner did not offer or admit the *Agency Fact Finding Report* into evidence. The Board did not consider this document when rendering its decision.

The Board finds based on a preponderance of the credible evidence that the employer met its burden of demonstrating that the claimant's actions rose to the level of gross misconduct within the meaning of *Maryland Annotated, Labor & Employment Article, § 8-1002*. The decision of the hearing examiner shall be reversed for the reasons stated herein.

## **DECISION**

It is held that the claimant was discharged for gross misconduct connected with the work, within the meaning of Maryland Code Annotated, Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Section 1002. The claimant is disqualified from receiving benefits from the week beginning November 11, 2012 and until the claimant becomes re-employed, earns at least twenty five times their weekly benefit amount and thereafter becomes unemployed through no fault of their own.

The Hearing Examiner's decision is reversed.



Eileen M. Rehrmann, Associate Member



Donna Watts-Lamont, Chairperson

VD

Copies mailed to:

MARLON S. FRANCOIS  
CHALLENGER TRANSPORTATION INC  
Susan Bass, Office of the Assistant Secretary

## **UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS DECISION**

MARLON S FRANCOIS

SSN #

**Claimant**

vs.

CHALLENGER TRANSPORTATION INC

**Employer/Agency**

Before the:  
**Maryland Department of Labor,  
Licensing and Regulation  
Division of Appeals**  
1100 North Eutaw Street  
Room 511  
Baltimore, MD 21201  
(410) 767-2421

Appeal Number: 1242065  
Appellant: Claimant  
Local Office : 61 / COLLEGE PARK  
CLAIM CENTER

January 14, 2013

**For the Claimant:** PRESENT

**For the Employer:** PRESENT, MIKE HEALY

**For the Agency:**

### **ISSUE(S)**

Whether the claimant's separation from this employment was for a disqualifying reason within the meaning of the MD. Code Annotated Labor and Employment Article, Title 8, Sections 1002 - 1002.1 (Gross/Aggravated Misconduct connected with the work), 1003 (Misconduct connected with the work) or 1001 (Voluntary Quit for good cause).

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Claimant (Marlon Francois) filed a claim for benefits establishing a benefit year beginning November 11, 2012. He qualified for a weekly benefit amount of \$276.00.

The Claimant began working for this Employer (Challenger Transportation, Inc.) on December 31, 2007. At the time of separation, the Claimant was working as a Driver. The Claimant last worked for the Employer on November 16, 2012, before being terminated for allegedly violating the Employer's attendance party.

The Employer has an attendance policy which provides that any employing exceeding ten (10) points within a twelve (12) month period would be subject to termination, a copy of which the Claimant received in 2009.

The Claimant was written up on a few occasions for attendance. The Employer issued write-ups that were signed by someone other than the Claimant. The Claimant had been injured on the job on May 18, 2012 and provided the Employer with medical disability slips regarding the same. The Claimant incurred a herniated disk and was placed on light duty by his physician. The Claimant also provided the Employer with medical documentation for June 20 and November 14, 2012. The Claimant was terminated for his last absence even though he provided medical documentation to evidence the same.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003 provides for a disqualification from benefits where the claimant is discharged or suspended as a disciplinary measure for misconduct connected with the work. The term "misconduct" is undefined in the statute but has been defined as "...a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, the commission of a forbidden act, a dereliction of duty, or a course of wrongful conduct committed by an employee, within the scope of his employment relationship, during hours of employment, or on the employer's premises." Rogers v. Radio Shack, 271 Md. 126, 132 (1974).

## **EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE**

The Hearing Examiner considered all of the testimony and evidence of record in reaching this decision. Where the evidence was in conflict, the Hearing Examiner decided the facts on the credible evidence as determined by the Hearing Examiner.

The employer had the burden to show, by a preponderance of the credible evidence, that the claimant was discharged for some degree of misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of the Maryland Unemployment Insurance Law. Ivey v. Catterton Printing Company, 441-BH-89. In the case at bar, that burden has not been met.

The Claimant did not engage in misconduct. The Employer issued several written warnings to the Claimant; however the evidence demonstrates that some of the write-ups were signed by someone other than the Claimant. Therefore, the Employer did not place the Claimant on formal notice that his job was in jeopardy because the Claimant did not receive notice that he was allegedly in violation of the Employer's policy. The Claimant further provided the Employer with medical disability slips excusing some of his absences. The Employer still terminated the Claimant in direct contradiction to its point system attendance policy. Consequently, the Employer failed to prove that the Claimant violated some established, enforced Employer policy.

I hold that the Claimant did not commit a transgression of some established rule or policy of the employer, a forbidden act, a dereliction of duty, or engage in a course of wrongful conduct within the scope of the Claimant's employment relationship, during hours of employment, or on the employer's premises. No unemployment disqualification shall be imposed based on Md. Code, Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003 pursuant to this separation from this employment.

## DECISION

IT IS HELD, that the Claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct connected with the work within the meaning of Md. Code Ann., Labor & Emp. Article, Section 8-1003. No disqualification is imposed based upon the Claimant's separation from employment with the above-identified Employer. The Claimant is eligible for benefits so long as all other eligibility requirements are met. The Claimant may contact Claimant Information Service concerning the other eligibility requirements of the law at [ui@dllr.state.md.us](mailto:ui@dllr.state.md.us) or call 410-949-0022 from the Baltimore region, or 1-800-827-4839 from outside the Baltimore area. Deaf Claimants with TTY may contact Client Information Service at 410-767-2727, or outside the Baltimore area at 1-800-827-4400.

The determination of the Claims Specialist is reversed.

*L Williamson*

---

L Williamson, Esq.  
Hearing Examiner

### **Notice of Right to Request Waiver of Overpayment**

The Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation may seek recovery of any overpayment received by the Claimant. Pursuant to Section 8-809 of the Labor and Employment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, and Code of Maryland Regulations 09.32.07.01 through 09.32.07.09, the Claimant has a right to request a waiver of recovery of this overpayment. This request may be made by contacting Overpayment Recoveries Unit at 410-767-2404. If this request is made, the Claimant is entitled to a hearing on this issue.

**A request for waiver of recovery of overpayment does not act as an appeal of this decision.**

**Esto es un documento legal importante que decide si usted recibirá los beneficios del seguro del desempleo. Si usted disiente de lo que fue decidido, usted tiene un tiempo limitado a apelar esta decisión. Si usted no entiende cómo apelar, usted puede contactar (301) 313-8000 para una explicación.**

### **Notice of Right of Further Appeal**

Any party may request a further appeal either in person, by facsimile or by mail with the Board of Appeals. Under COMAR 09.32.06.01A(1) appeals may not be filed by e-mail. Your appeal must be filed by January 29, 2013. You may file your request for further appeal in person at or by mail to the following address:

Board of Appeals  
1100 North Eutaw Street  
Room 515  
Baltimore, Maryland 21201  
Fax 410-767-2787  
Phone 410-767-2781

**NOTE:** Appeals filed by mail are considered timely on the date of the U.S. Postal Service postmark.

Date of hearing: January 09, 2013

BLP/Specialist ID: WCP2D

Seq No: 001

Copies mailed on January 14, 2013 to:

MARLON S. FRANCOIS  
CHALLENGER TRANSPORTATION INC  
LOCAL OFFICE #61