

**IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**JUSTIN J ATEN**  
Claimant

**WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIST**  
Employer

**APPEAL 24A-UI-01895-PT-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 01/14/24  
Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Overpayment of Benefits  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer Participation in Fact-finding Interview

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer, Waterloo Community School District, filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 9, 2024 (reference 01) that held the claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 22, 2024. The claimant did not participate. The employer participated through Chief Human Resources Officer Anthony Spurgetis and Employee Relations Specialist Korey Minard. Employer's Exhibits 1 and 2 were admitted into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct.  
Whether the claimant has been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, whether the repayment of those benefits to the agency can be waived.  
Whether any charges to the employer's account can be waived.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant worked as a full-time system specialist for Waterloo Community School District from December 9, 2019, to January 11, 2024, when he was discharged. As a system specialist, the claimant was responsible for driving to various school district buildings, reviewing the buildings' mechanical systems, and repairing any identified problems. The claimant worked from 6:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

The employer maintains a drug and alcohol policy that prohibits being under the influence of alcohol while at work. The policy warns employees that being under the influence of alcohol or other controlled substances while at work could result in discipline up to and including termination of employment. The claimant was aware of the employer's drug and alcohol policy.

On January 8, 2024, an employee reported that he heard a loud crash. When the employee went outside to investigate, he saw the claimant standing next to a school district vehicle looking

at apparent damage caused to another employee's vehicle. When the employee asked the claimant what had happened, the claimant responded in a confused, incoherent manner. The employee described the claimant as "out of it." The employee reported that the claimant was slurring his speech and was leaning on the vehicle to keep his balance. The claimant then got into the school district vehicle and drove away. The employee reported what he witnessed to his supervisor.

The employee's supervisor contacted the Human Resources Department, and an HR officer called the claimant into a meeting to observe his behavior. During the meeting, the claimant's speech was slurred and he smelled of alcohol. Based on her observations, the HR officer requested the claimant to submit to a breathalyzer test. The claimant agreed to do so.

The HR officer drove the claimant to Cedar Valley Occupational Health for alcohol testing. A trained nurse administered two breathalyzer tests fifteen minutes apart. The first test showed an alcohol content of .148 and the second test showed an alcohol content of .144, both significantly above the legal limit. The claimant was provided a copy of the test results. After the alcohol tests, the employer suspended the claimant pending an investigation.

On January 11, 2024, the employer called the claimant into a meeting and confronted the claimant with the results of its investigation. When asked whether he was intoxicated when he crashed the employer's vehicle on January 8, 2024, the claimant denied that he had been drinking and denied having been intoxicated. However, the claimant could not provide a satisfactory explanation for the accident, his behavior, or the results of the breathalyzer tests. At the end of the meeting, the employer informed the claimant that his employment was being terminated effective immediately for operating a school district vehicle while under the influence of alcohol in violation of the employer's drug and alcohol policy.

The claimant's administrative records indicate that the claimant filed his original claim for benefits with an effective date of January 14, 2024, and weekly continued claims for benefits for two weeks between February 18 and March 2, 2024. The claimant has received total unemployment insurance benefits of \$1,164.00. The employer participated in the fact-finding interview with Iowa Workforce Development.

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

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) and (d) provide:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits, regardless of the source of the individual's wage credits:

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 disqualification shall continue 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.

...

d. For the purposes of this subsection, "misconduct" means a deliberate act or omission by an employee that constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising

out of the employee's contract of employment. Misconduct is 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. Misconduct by an individual includes but is not limited to all of the following:

...

(2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.

...

(5) Reporting to work under the influence of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in an off-label manner, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies, unless the individual is compelled to work by the employer outside of scheduled or on-call working hours.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(4) provides:

(4) *Report required.* The claimant's statement and employer's statement must give detailed facts as to the specific reason for the claimant's discharge. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. In cases where a suspension or disciplinary layoff exists, the claimant is considered as discharged, and the issue of misconduct shall be resolved.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct.* While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job-related misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating the claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The gravity of the incident, number of policy violations and prior warnings are factors considered when analyzing misconduct. The lack of a current warning may detract from a finding of an intentional policy violation.

In an at-will employment environment 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, it incurs potential liability for unemployment insurance benefits related to that separation.

The Iowa Supreme Court has held that an employer may not “benefit from an unauthorized drug test by relying on it as a basis to disqualify an employee from unemployment compensation benefits.” *Eaton v. Iowa Emp’t Appeal Bd.*, 602 N.W.2d 553, 557, 558 (Iowa 1999). Testing under Iowa Code section 730.5(4) allows employers to test employees for drugs and/or alcohol but requires the employer “adhere to the requirements . . . concerning the conduct of such testing and the use and disposition of the results.”

Iowa Code section 730.5(1)j allows drug testing of an employee upon “reasonable suspicion” that an employee’s faculties are impaired on the job or on an unannounced random basis. It also allows testing as a condition of continued employment or hiring. Iowa Code § 730.5(4). Testing shall include confirmation of initial positive test results. For breathalyzer testing, initial and confirmatory testing may be conducted pursuant to the employer’s written policy. A policy shall include requirements governing breath testing devices, alcohol screening devices, and qualifications for administering personnel.

In this case, the claimant violated the employer’s policy when he tested positive for alcohol while at work. While the employer’s policy does not include requirements governing breath testing devices, alcohol screening devices, and qualifications for administering personnel, the evidence in the record indicates that the claimant’s behavior while at work constituted reasonable suspicion of intoxication. The claimant then agreed to a breathalyzer test, which was performed at a certified lab by a trained nurse, two tests were administered 15 minutes apart, and both tests showed a blood alcohol content well above the legal limit. Under these circumstances, the administrative law judge concludes the employer substantially complied with the Iowa Code section 730.5. However, even if the results of the breathalyzer test could not be relied upon, the employer’s un rebutted testimony that the claimant drove a school district vehicle into another employee’s car while demonstrating clear signs of intoxication and then drove away from the scene of the accident without reporting the accident, is sufficient to establish a current act of disqualifying misconduct. As such, benefits must be denied.

The next issues to be determined are whether claimant has been overpaid benefits, whether the claimant must repay those benefits, and whether the employer’s account will be charged. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes:

Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a, b, as amended in 2008, provides:

Payment – determination – duration – child support intercept.

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) (a) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer’s account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment

compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if un rebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871 subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing

will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for those benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that they did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7).

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,164.00. There is no evidence that the claimant received these benefits due to fraud or willful misrepresentation. Because the employer participated in fact-finding, the claimant is obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

**DECISION:**

The February 9, 2024, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for substantial, job-related misconduct. Unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa are denied until the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount after the January 11, 2024 separation date, and provided he is otherwise eligible.

The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$1,164.00 and is obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer participated in fact-finding and its account shall not be charged.



---

Patrick B. Thomas  
Administrative Law Judge

---

May 6, 2024  
Decision Dated and Mailed

PBT/jkb

**APPEAL RIGHTS.** If you disagree with the decision, you or any interested party may:

1. Appeal to the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days of the date under the judge's signature by submitting a written appeal via mail, fax, or online to:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board  
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100  
Des Moines, Iowa 50321  
Fax: (515)281-7191  
Online: [eab.iowa.gov](http://eab.iowa.gov)**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

**AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD SHALL STATE CLEARLY:**

- 1) The name, address, and social security number of the claimant.
- 2) A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- 3) That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4) The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

An Employment Appeal Board decision is final agency action. If a party disagrees with the Employment Appeal Board decision, they may then file a petition for judicial review in district court.

2. If no one files an appeal of the judge's decision with the Employment Appeal Board within fifteen (15) days, the decision becomes final agency action, and you have the option to file a petition for judicial review in District Court within thirty (30) days after the decision becomes final. Additional information on how to file a petition can be found at Iowa Code §17A.19, which is online at <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> or by contacting the District Court Clerk of Court <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

**Note to Parties:** YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in the appeal or obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds.

**Note to Claimant:** It is important that you file your weekly claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

**SERVICE INFORMATION:**

A true and correct copy of this decision was mailed to each of the parties listed.



**DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN.** Si no está de acuerdo con la decisión, usted o cualquier parte interesada puede:

1. Apelar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo dentro de los quince (15) días de la fecha bajo la firma del juez presentando una apelación por escrito por correo, fax o en línea a:

**Iowa Employment Appeal Board  
6200 Park Avenue Suite 100  
Des Moines, Iowa 50321  
Fax: (515)281-7191  
En línea: [eab.iowa.gov](http://eab.iowa.gov)**

El período de apelación se extenderá hasta el siguiente día hábil si el último día para apelar cae en fin de semana o día feriado legal.

**UNA APELACIÓN A LA JUNTA DEBE ESTABLECER CLARAMENTE:**

- 1) El nombre, dirección y número de seguro social del reclamante.
- 2) Una referencia a la decisión de la que se toma la apelación.
- 3) Que se interponga recurso de apelación contra tal decisión y se firme dicho recurso.
- 4) Los fundamentos en que se funda dicho recurso.

Una decisión de la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo es una acción final de la agencia. Si una de las partes no está de acuerdo con la decisión de la Junta de Apelación de Empleo, puede presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el tribunal de distrito.

2. Si nadie presenta una apelación de la decisión del juez ante la Junta de Apelaciones Laborales dentro de los quince (15) días, la decisión se convierte en acción final de la agencia y usted tiene la opción de presentar una petición de revisión judicial en el Tribunal de Distrito dentro de los treinta (30) días después de que la decisión adquiriera firmeza. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre cómo presentar una petición en el Código de Iowa §17A.19, que se encuentra en línea en <https://www.legis.iowa.gov/docs/code/17A.19.pdf> o comunicándose con el Tribunal de Distrito Secretario del tribunal <https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/court-directory/>.

**Nota para las partes:** USTED PUEDE REPRESENTARSE en la apelación u obtener un abogado u otra parte interesada para que lo haga, siempre que no haya gastos para Workforce Development. Si desea ser representado por un abogado, puede obtener los servicios de un abogado privado o uno cuyos servicios se paguen con fondos públicos.

**Nota para el reclamante:** es importante que presente su reclamo semanal según las instrucciones, mientras esta apelación está pendiente, para proteger su derecho continuo a los beneficios.

**SERVICIO DE INFORMACIÓN:**

Se envió por correo una copia fiel y correcta de esta decisión a cada una de las partes enumeradas.