IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

MICHAEL J BLOOMQUIST

Claimant

APPEAL 16A-UI-04445-DGT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

FOCUS SERVICES LLC

Employer

OC: 03/27/16

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code § 730.5 – Private Sector Drug-free Workplaces

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated April 11, 2016, (reference 01) that held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on April 29, 2016. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Brent Albrechtsen, Site Director.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant last worked for employer on March 25, 2016. Employer discharged claimant on March 25, 2016, because claimant did not pass a drug screening at work.

The claimant was discharged after a positive drug screen which was administered on March 25, 2016. The results were not provided to claimant in writing delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested. The claimant was not offered a split sample test. Employer did not provide documentary evidence of a written drug screen policy.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden of proving disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

lowa Code § 730.5 allows drug testing of an employee if, among other conditions, the employer has "probable cause to believe that an employee's faculties are impaired on the job." lowa Code § 730.5(9) requires that a written drug screen policy be provided to every employee subject to testing. lowa Code § 730.5(7)(i)(1) mandates that an employer, upon a confirmed positive drug or alcohol test by a certified laboratory, notify the employee of the test results by certified mail return receipt requested, and the right to obtain a confirmatory test before taking disciplinary action against an employee. Upon a positive drug screen, lowa Code § 730.5(9)(g) requires, under certain circumstances, that an employer offer substance abuse evaluation and treatment to an employee the first time the employee has a positive drug test. The lowa 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. lowa Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 602 N.W.2d 553, 557, 558 (lowa 1999).

While the employer certainly was within its rights to test and fire the claimant, it failed to provide him a written copy of the drug testing policy, sufficient notice of the test results, and an opportunity for a split sample test according to the strict and explicit statutory requirements. Thus, the employer cannot use the results of the drug screen as a basis for disqualification from benefits and benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The April 11,	2016,	(reference	01)	decision	is	affirmed.	The	claimant	was	discharged	from
employment f	or no d	isqualifying	reas	son. Ben	efits	s are allowe	ed, pi	rovided he	e is o	therwise elig	jible.

Duane L. Golden Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/css