# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section 1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319 DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE 68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

## JAMES B WIRTJERS 1212 BAILY ST SAC CITY IA 50583

# JW READY MIX AND CONSTRUCTION INC $3111 - 270^{TH}$ ST SAC CITY IA 50583

# Appeal Number:04A-UI-08160-SWTOC : 07/04/04R : 01Claimant: Appellant (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.

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.

#### 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.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may 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. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated July 21, 2004, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on July 21, 2004. The claimant participated in the hearing. Pat Wirtjers participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer from 1980 to May 18, 2004. The claimant was informed and understood that under the employer's work rules, employees were required to submit to a drug test under certain circumstances, including randomly, and were subject to termination if they tested positive for drugs and failed to comply with the return-to-work requirements of the policy. Under the policy, any employee who tests positive must be

evaluated and follow the treatment recommended by a substance abuse professional along with a negative return-to-work test before being allowed to return to work.

Pursuant to the policy, the claimant was required to submit to a random drug test on April 27, 2004. A urine sample was properly taken from the claimant and properly analyzed using an initial drug screen test and subsequent confirmatory test by a certified laboratory. The analysis disclosed the presence of amphetamines in the claimant's system at a level that would demonstrate the claimant had used amphetamines in violation of the employer's policy. The employer discharged the claimant on May 18, 2004 after the employer received the results of the drug test, and the claimant refused to be evaluated and treated for drug abuse.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

Iowa Code Section 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.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. <u>Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The claimant's violation of a known work rule was a willful and material breach of the duties and obligations to the employer and a substantial disregard of the standards of behavior the employer had the right to expect of the claimant. The claimant refused to follow the employer's work rules, which require employees to seek treatment following a failed drug test. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case.

### DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated July 21, 2004, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits until he has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

saw/tjc