

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**MICHAEL J WHITE**  
Claimant

**WORKSOURCE INC**  
Employer

**APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-02084-ST**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 01/15/12  
Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge  
871 IAC 24.32(1) – Definition of Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant appealed a department decision dated February 20, 2012, reference 01, that held he was discharged for misconduct on November 15, 2011, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on March 19, 2012. The claimant participated. Derrick Flippin, Senior Account Manager, participated for the employer.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge having heard the testimony of the witnesses, and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The claimant began employment on assignment for his temporary employment firm January 13, 2005. After working several assignments, claimant began work at a temp-to-hire to Airmark Uniform Services on April 8, 2011. As he was finishing the assignment, the claimant and Airmark advised the employer it wanted to hire him.

As part of the pre-employment process, claimant submitted to Airmark drug testing. He failed the drug testing. When the employer learned about it, management decided not to offer claimant any further work assignments.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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(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 administrative law judge concludes the employer has established that the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment on November 17, 2011.

Claimant failed a drug screen pre-employment test for a different employer that is not employer misconduct. He failed a drug screen for a prospective employer not the employer for who he had completed the work assignment. The employer election not to offer claimant for work does not constitute job disqualifying misconduct.

**DECISION:**

The department decision dated February 20, 2012, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was not discharged for misconduct on November 17, 2011. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Randy L. Stephenson  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/pjs