

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

KEVIN D MEIER

Claimant

SEARS MANUFACTURING CO

Employer

APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-01328-B2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 01/11/15

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated January 28, 2015, reference 01, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on February 25, 2015. Claimant participated personally. Employer failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether claimant was discharged for misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: As claimant was the only participant in the hearing, all findings of fact are gleaned from claimant's testimony. Claimant last worked for employer on January 12, 2015. Employer discharged claimant on January 12, 2015 because claimant tested positive for marijuana on a random drug test. Claimant had previously tested positive on another drug test on January 8, 2014.

Claimant was called out on December 18, 2014 to take a drug test. Claimant blew into a Breathalyzer and dropped a UA as requested. Approximately a week later claimant received a call from a doctor stating that he'd tested positive. Claimant was offered an opportunity to take another test at that time but he declined it.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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, (8) provide:

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).

(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.

In this matter, the evidence fails to establish that claimant was discharged for an act of misconduct when claimant violated employer's policy concerning drug testing. Claimant was warned concerning this policy.

Iowa 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." Iowa Code section 730.5(8) sets forth the circumstances under which an employer may test employees for the presence of drugs. Claimant was randomly selected for unannounced testing and was not tested as part of drug rehabilitation. See section 730.5(8)a, b. The testing on was not part of a pre-employment screening and was not required by federal law or by law enforcement. See 730.5(8)d, e. The testing was not done as a result of claimant being involved in an accident at work. See 730.5(8)f. The only other basis under which the employer could legitimately test claimant was reasonable suspicion. See 730.5(8)c.

Upon a positive drug screen, Iowa Code § 730.5(3)(f) requires that an employer offer substance abuse evaluation and treatment to an employee the first time the employee has a positive alcohol test. Iowa Code § 730.5(9) requires that a written drug screen policy be provided to every employee subject to testing. Iowa 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 and the right to obtain a confirmatory test before taking disciplinary action against an employee. Upon a positive drug screen, Iowa 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 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 Employment Appeal Board*, 602 N.W.2d 553, 557, 558 (Iowa 1999).

The last incident, which brought about the discharge fails to constitute misconduct because claimant was not sent notice of his rights by certified mail. This requirement is mandatory. There is no alternate method of notice allowed. In person notice of rights is not sufficient. The Iowa Courts have held that certified mail notice is mandatory. *Harrison v. Employment Appeal Board*, 659 N.W.2d 581 (IA 2003). The test was invalid due to the failure to follow Iowa law. The administrative law judge holds that claimant was not discharged for an act of misconduct and, as such, is not disqualified for the receipt of unemployment insurance benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated January 28, 2015, reference 01, is reversed. Claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided claimant meets all other eligibility requirements.

Blair A. Bennett
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/can