

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**CLAIMANT**

**APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-05757-JTT**

**EMPLOYER**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 04/26/15**

**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

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

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the May 8, 2015, reference 01, decision that disqualified him for benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on June 25, 2015. The claimant participated. The employer representative was not available at the number the employer provided for the hearing and did not participate.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant began his full-time employment in 2013. The employer discharged the claimant on April 24, 2015 in connection with a positive drug test. The claimant performed work as a farm chemical applicator. The claimant's duties included operating a semi tractor-trailer. The truck driving work required a commercial driver's license and subjected the claimant to federal department of transportation drug testing requirements. The employer has a drug testing policy. The claimant's drug test was prompted by the claimant's parents bringing a controlled substance, methamphetamine, to the claimant's workplace in an attempt to get help for the claimant. The claimant's supervisor requested the drug test. The claimant's supervisor assured the claimant that he would not be fired in connection with the matter and that the employer only wanted to get him some help. The claimant provided a urine specimen for testing. The specimen was collected as a split specimen. About a week after the claimant provided the specimen for testing, a medical review officer from the testing lab contacted the claimant and notified him that his urine specimen had tested positive for methamphetamine. The M.R.O. offered additional testing of the other portion of the specimen, but the claimant declined additional testing. A few days later, a human resources representative notified the claimant that he was discharged from the employment in connection with the drug test.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF 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.

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 proof in this matter. See Iowa Code section 96.6(2). Misconduct must be substantial in order to justify a denial of unemployment benefits. Misconduct serious enough to warrant the discharge of an employee is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits. See Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000). The focus is on deliberate, intentional, or culpable acts by the employee. See Gimbel v. Employment Appeal Board, 489 N.W.2d 36, 39 (Iowa Ct. App. 1992).

While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of the current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act(s) alone. The termination of employment must be based on a current act. See 871 IAC 24.32(8). In determining whether the conduct that prompted the discharge constituted a "current act," the administrative law judge considers the date on which the conduct came to the attention of the employer and the date on which the employer notified the claimant that the conduct subjected the claimant to possible discharge. See also Greene v. EAB, 426 N.W.2d 659, 662 (Iowa App. 1988).

Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. If the employer is unwilling to furnish available evidence to corroborate the allegation, misconduct cannot be established. See 871 IAC 24.32(4). When it is in a party's power to produce more direct and satisfactory evidence than is actually produced, it may fairly be inferred that the more direct evidence will expose deficiencies in that party's case. See Crosser v. Iowa Dept. of Public Safety, 240 N.W.2d 682 (Iowa 1976).

The first issue in this case is the effect of the confidentiality requirements of the federal law. The Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act of 1991 authorized the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) to prescribe regulations for testing of commercial motor vehicle operators. 49 USC § 31306. Congress required that the regulations provide for "the confidentiality of test results and medical information" of employees tested under the law. 49 USC § 31306(c)(7). Pursuant to this grant of rulemaking authority, the DOT established confidentiality provisions in 49 CFR 40.321 that prohibit the release of individual test results or medical information about an employee to third parties without the employee's written consent. There is an exception, however, to that rule for administrative proceedings (e.g. unemployment compensation hearing) involving an employee who has tested positive under a DOT drug or alcohol test. 49 CFR 40.323(a)(1). The exception allows an employer to release the information to the decisionmaker in such a proceeding, provided the decisionmaker issues a binding stipulation that the information released will only be made available to the parties to the proceeding. 49 CFR 40.323(b). In the statement of the case, a stipulation in compliance with the regulation has been entered.

The federal confidentiality provision must be followed despite conflicting provisions of the Iowa Open Records Act (Iowa Code chapter 22), the Iowa Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (Iowa Code chapter 17A), and Iowa Employment Security Law (Iowa Code chapter 96). The federal confidentiality laws regarding drug testing must be followed because, under the Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const., Art. VI, cl. 2, state laws that "interfere with, or are contrary to the laws of congress, made in pursuance of the constitution" are invalid. Wisconsin Public Intervenor v. Mortier, 501 U.S. 597, 604 (1991).

In this case, the Iowa Open Records law, APA, and Employment Security law actually conflict with the federal statute 49 USC § 31306(c)(7) and the implementing regulations 49 CFR 40.321 to the extent that they would require the release of individual test results or medical information about an employee to third parties beyond the claimant, employer, and the decisionmaker in this case. It would defeat the purpose of the federal law of providing confidentiality to permit the information regarding the test results to be disclosed to the general public. Since the decision to discharge the claimant was based on his testing positive on a DOT drug test, it would be impossible to issue a public decision identifying the claimant without disclosing the drug test results. Therefore, the public decision in this case will be issued without identifying information. A decision with identifying information will be issued to the parties; but that decision, the exhibits, and the audio record (all of which contain confidential and identifying information) shall be sealed and not publicly disclosed.

The next 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.

The Iowa Supreme Court has ruled that an employer cannot establish disqualifying misconduct based on a drug test performed in violation of Iowa's drug testing laws. Harrison v. Employment Appeal Board, 659 N.W.2d 581 (Iowa 2003); Eaton v. Employment Appeal Board, 602 N.W.2d 553, 558 (Iowa 1999). As the court in Eaton stated, "It would be contrary to the spirit of chapter 730 to allow an employer to benefit from an unauthorized drug test by relying on it as a basis to disqualify an employee from unemployment compensation benefits." Eaton, 602 N.W.2d at 558.

Iowa's drug testing laws, however, do not apply to employees who are required to be tested under federal law and regulations. Iowa Code section 730.5-2. Although the court has not addressed this issue, it is logical that the courts would likewise require compliance with federal law before disqualifying a claimant who was discharged for failing a drug test required by federal law and regulations.

The employer did not participate in the hearing and, thereby, did not present any evidence to establish that the claimant was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that would disqualify the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits. In the absence of testimony or other evidence from the employer to establish that the testing policy and procedure complied with the applicable federal drug testing law, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits.

**DECISION:**

The May 8, 2015, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged for no disqualifying reason. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided he is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/css