

BEFORE THE  
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
Lucas State Office Building  
Fourth floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

---

**JACOB S ANDREW**

Claimant

and

**PACKERS SANITATION SVCS INC**

Employer

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**HEARING NUMBER: 19BUI-05044**

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
DECISION**

**NOTICE**

**THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL** unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

**A REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION: 96.5-2-A**

**DECISION**

**UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE**

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board, one member dissenting, finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

---

James M. Strohman

**DISSENTING OPINION OF KIM D. SCHMETT:**

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the administrative law judge's decision. I would find the Claimant quit after being issued a reasonable directive to submit to a drug test after the Employer received a report of drug abuse in the workplace. The Claimant was offered several options to comply, two of which offered him privacy. The Claimant left the medical facility after being asked to submit a urine sample and didn't return to work. Based on this record, I conclude he quit without good cause attributable to the Employer. Benefits should be denied until such time he has worked in and was paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. See, Iowa Code section 96.5(1)"g".

---

Kim D. Schmett

The Employer submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by the Employer was not presented at hearing. Accordingly all the new and additional information submitted has not been relied upon in making our decision, and has received no weight whatsoever, but rather has been wholly disregarded.

---

Kim D. Schmett

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

---

James M. Strohman