IN THE IOWA ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS DIVISION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

HUNTER L ZANDARSKI

Claimant

APPEAL 23A-UI-10899-AR-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

AMCOR RIGID PLASTICS USA, INC

Employer

OC: 10/29/23

Claimant: Respondent (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871—24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On November 21, 2023, the employer filed an appeal from the November 15, 2023, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based on the determination that claimant was discharged from employment without a showing of disqualifying misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on December 11, 2023. Claimant, Hunter L. Zandarski, did not participate. Employer, Amcor Rigid Plastics USA, Inc., participated through HR Manager Katie Walker and Plant Manager Jeff Thede. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 5 were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUES:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct? Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant began working for employer on February 24, 2020. Claimant last worked as a full-time inspector quality tech level 4. Claimant was separated from employment on October 23, 2023, when he was discharged.

The employer maintains a drug-free workplace policy. It specifies that the employer may request that employees submit to a drug screen based on reasonable suspicion. It does not explicitly dictate what constitutes reasonable suspicion. It states that a refusal to submit to such a drug screen will be interpreted as a positive drug screen result and will result in discipline, up to and including discharge. Claimant received and signed for a copy of the drug-free workplace policy at hire, in February 2020. The employer, including Walker and Thede, had reasonable suspicion training on October 6, 2023. This was intensive training to assist the employer to

identify the signs of intoxication. The training was the first of regular trainings that will occur for supervisors in the future.

Claimant last worked on October 19, 2023. That day, a coworker reported to claimant's supervisor, Nicole Provost, that claimant was vaping on the production floor. Specifically, the coworker saw claimant bring what he thought was a vape pen to his mouth, and then he saw vapor or smoke come from claimant's mouth. There was no indication how far away this coworker was from claimant. Vaping or smoking of any kind are prohibited on the production floor. Provost called claimant to the office with Thede and Walker. Claimant denied vaping on the production floor. During this meeting, the employer's witnesses determined that claimant was acting strangely, suggesting he was under the influence of some intoxicant. Specifically, Thede observed that claimant was very nervous, but was also moving slowly and his posture was very poor. He also observed that claimant's eyes were glazed over and he appeared sleepy. Walker informed claimant that, because of the observations, the employer would ask that claimant submit to a reasonable suspicion drug screen. Claimant initially agreed, and also denied being under the influence. He informed the employer that he has a medical marijuana card. The employer told claimant that if the screen resulted in a positive for marijuana use, it would discuss with legal and make a determination regarding next steps, because it had not been confronted with that issue before.

Thede was going to transport claimant to the clinic for testing. Once outside of the worksite, claimant informed Thede that he was just going to go home. Thede told claimant that if the screen only returned a positive for marijuana, the medical marijuana card might allow claimant to retain his job. However, Thede also informed claimant that if he refused the drug screen, it was very likely that claimant's employment would end. Claimant told Thede that the screen would likely return a positive result for more than marijuana. Claimant refused to complete the drug screen and went home. The employer discharged claimant from employment effective October 23, 2023, for refusing to complete the drug screen.

The administrative record indicates that clamant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of October 29, 2023. His weekly benefit amount is \$582.00. He has filed for and received unemployment insurance benefits between October 29, 2023, and December 2, 2023. He has received unemployment insurance benefits in the gross amount of \$2,910.00. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

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

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 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 even 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:
- (1) Material falsification of the individual's employment application.
- (2) Knowing violation of a reasonable and uniformly enforced rule of an employer.
- (3) Intentional damage of an employer's property.
- (4) Consumption of alcohol, illegal or nonprescribed prescription drugs, or an impairing substance in a manner not directed by the manufacturer, or a combination of such substances, on the employer's premises in violation of the employer's employment policies.
- (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.
- (6) Conduct that substantially and unjustifiably endangers the personal safety of coworkers or the general public.
- (7) Incarceration for an act for which one could reasonably expect to be incarcerated that results in missing work.
- (8) Incarceration as a result of a misdemeanor or felony conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- (9) Excessive unexcused tardiness or absenteeism.
- (10) Falsification of any work-related report, task, or job that could expose the employer or coworkers to legal liability or sanction for violation of health or safety laws.
- (11) Failure to maintain any license, registration, or certification that is reasonably required by the employer or by law, or that is a functional requirement to perform the individual's regular job duties, unless the failure is not within the control of the individual.

- (12) Conduct that is libelous or slanderous toward an employer or an employee of the employer if such conduct is not protected under state or federal law.
- (13) Theft of an employer or coworker's funds or property.
- (14) Intentional misrepresentation of time worked or work carried out that results in the individual receiving unearned wages or unearned benefits.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

When an employee is discharged due to their failure to pass or refusal to submit to drug testing, the employer must comply with lowa Code section 730.5. If an employer chooses to conduct alcohol or drug testing, it must substantially comply with all the requirements of this statute. If an employer has an alcohol or drug testing policy, it must be in writing. Iowa Code § 730.5(9)(a)(1). The policy must have been provided to every employee subject to testing and must be available for review by employees and prospective employees. Iowa Code § 730.5(9)(a)(1).

The employer requested that the claimant submit to a drug test based on the reasonable suspicion prong of Iowa Code section 730.5.

Iowa Code section 730.5(8) provides:

8. Drug or alcohol testing.

Employers may conduct drug or alcohol testing as provided in this subsection: a. Employers may conduct unannounced drug or alcohol testing of employees who are selected from any of the following pools of employees:

- (1) The entire employee population at a particular work site of the employer except for employees not subject to testing pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, or employees who are not scheduled to be at work at the time the testing is conducted because of the status of the employees or who have been excused from work pursuant to the employer's work policy prior to the time the testing is announced to employees.
- (2) The entire full-time active employee population at a particular work site except for employees not subject to testing pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, or employees who are not scheduled to be at work at the time the testing is to be conducted because of the status of the employee or who have been excused from work pursuant to the employer's working policy.
- (3) All employees at a particular work site who are in a pool of employees in a safety-sensitive position and who are scheduled to be at work at the time testing is conducted, other than employees not subject to testing pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, or employees who are not scheduled to be at work at the time the testing is to be conducted or who have been excused from work pursuant to the employer's work policy prior to the time the testing is announced to employees.

- b. Employers may conduct drug or alcohol testing of employees during, and after completion of, drug or alcohol rehabilitation.
- c. Employers may conduct reasonable suspicion drug or alcohol testing.
- d. Employers may conduct drug or alcohol testing of prospective employees.
- e. Employers may conduct drug or alcohol testing as required by federal law or regulation or by law enforcement.

Iowa Code section 730.5(1)(i) provides:

- i. "Reasonable suspicion drug or alcohol testing "means drug or alcohol testing based upon evidence that an employee is using or has used alcohol or other drugs in violation of the employer's written policy drawn from specific objective and articulable facts and reasonable inferences drawn from those facts in light of experience. For purposes of this paragraph, facts and inferences may be based upon, but not limited to, any of the following:
- (1) Observable phenomena while at work such as direct observation of alcohol or drug use or abuse or of the physical symptoms or manifestations of being impaired due to alcohol or other drug use.
- (2) Abnormal conduct or erratic behavior while at work or a significant deterioration in work performance.
- (3) A report of alcohol or other drug use provided by a reliable and credible source.
- (4) Evidence that an individual has tampered with any drug or alcohol test during the individual's employment with the current employer.
- (5) Evidence that an employee has caused an accident while at work which resulted in an injury to a person for which injury, if suffered by an employee, a record or report could be required under chapter 88, or resulted in damage to property, including to equipment, in an amount reasonably estimated at the time of the accident to exceed one thousand dollars.
- (6) Evidence that an employee has manufactured, sold, distributed, solicited, possessed, used, or transferred drugs while working or while on the employer's premises or while operating the employer's vehicle, machinery, or equipment.

The employer has met the requirements of Iowa Code section 730.5. The claimant received a copy of the employer's drug and alcohol use policy. The policy articulates the consequences when an employee refuses to cooperate with the drug screen or receives a positive test result.

The evidence in the record indicates that the claimant's behavior while at the worksite constitutes reasonable suspicion of intoxication. While claimant initially agreed to undergo the drug screen, he later refused and did not undergo the drug screen as requested. Accordingly, under the employer's drug-free workplace policy, claimant was discharged from employment. This constitutes disqualifying misconduct. 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. Iowa Code section 96.3(7)a-b provides:

- 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 lowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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 lowa 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.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he was not entitled. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for 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), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871—24.10. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. Since the employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview the claimant is not obligated to repay to the agency the benefits he received, and the employer's account shall be charged.

DECISION:

The November 15, 2023, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is REVERSED. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as 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 claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,910.00 and is not obligated to repay the agency those benefits. The employer did not participate in the fact-finding interview and its account shall be charged.

Alexis D. Rowe

Administrative Law Judge

Au DR

December 14, 2023

Decision Dated and Mailed

ar/scn

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

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 lowa 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

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 adquiera 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.