

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**GARY GOOD**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-06568-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CRST INC**  
Employer

**OC: 06/03/07 R: 12  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Gary Good (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated June 22, 2007, reference 01, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from CRST, Inc. (employer) for work-related misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on July 19, 2007. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Sandy Matt, Human Resources Specialist. Employer's Exhibits One and Two and Claimant's Exhibit A were admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-related misconduct.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time over-the-road truck driver from August 15, 2006 through May 7, 2007. The employer is governed by federal drug testing laws and has a written drug policy that informs employees of the drug testing procedures and for which drugs the employer will be testing. The policy provides that employees can be tested on a random basis and the claimant was chosen on a random basis by a third party on May 3, 2007. He signed the federal drug testing custody and control form on that date and a split urine sample was obtained. The claimant tested positive for cocaine and was advised of this fact by the medical review officer on May 7, 2007. Consequently, the claimant was discharged for violation of company policy in that he failed a random drug test.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has

discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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 employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for violation of the employer's drug and alcohol policy due to his positive drug test for cocaine. Iowa Code § 730.5 sets forth the rules by which a private company may screen its employees for use of illegal drugs. In order for a violation of an employer's drug or alcohol policy to be disqualifying misconduct, it must be based on a drug test performed in compliance with Iowa's drug testing laws. Eaton v. Iowa Employment Appeal Board, 602 N.W.2d 553, 558 (Iowa 1999).

However, when a drug test is administered pursuant to Federal law, the Iowa drug testing policy at Iowa Code § 730.5 does not apply. See Iowa Code § 730.5(2) and 49 C.F.R. 382.109 for Federal rules preempting state rules if compliance with the state requirement is an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the requirements of the Federal rules. Iowa Code § 730.5 has stricter requirements for a drug test than the Federal rules at 49 C.F.R. Subtitle A, Part 40. In the case herein, the claimant was an over-the-road truck driver, a position which is subject to the Federal Department of Transportation drug testing guidelines. The employer complied with the federal drug testing regulations and its own policies. The claimant violated those policies when he tested positive for cocaine. His violation of the employer's drug policy shows a willful

or wanton disregard of the standard of behavior the employer has the right to expect from an employee, as well as an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests and of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. The employer discharged the claimant for reasons amounting to work-connected misconduct and benefits are denied.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated June 22, 2007, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css