### IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

RASIM ZAJMOVIC Claimant

# APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-16835-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TITAN TIRE CORPORATION Employer

> Original Claim: 06/28/09 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Rasim Zajmovic (claimant) appealed a representative's October 29, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work with Titan Tire Corporation (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for December 15, 2009. The claimant participated personally through Nedim Hasanovic, Interpreter. The employer participated by Joyce Kain, Human Resources Manager.

#### **ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on July 23, 2001, as a full-time tire builder. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on November 2, 2007. The employer thought it had given the claimant a copy of the Drug Free Workplace policy, but he did not receive it.

On October 8, 2009, the claimant submitted to a random drug test. The employer suspended the claimant pending receipt of the results. On October 12, 2009, the employer received results stating the claimant tested positive for marijuana. The employer sent the claimant a termination letter and the test results by certified letter. The claimant was not offered any treatment. The claimant was told he could have the split sample tested. The claimant never used marijuana.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was not discharged for misconduct.

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 employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. <u>Cosper v.</u> <u>Iowa Department of Job Service</u>, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was terminated for violating the employer's drug policy. The claimant knew that any positive results on a random drug test would result in termination. The employer is entitled to take random drug testing and to discharge upon the receipt of a positive result.

lowa Code section 730.5(9) requires that a written drug screen policy be provided to every employee subject to testing. Iowa Code section 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 section 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 at 558.

The employer failed to provide the claimant with a written drug screen policy. The employer failed to give the claimant an opportunity for evaluation and treatment. The employer did not provide information to the claimant about an employee assistance program or other substance abuse programs as required by Iowa Code section 730.5(9)(c). Benefits are allowed.

## **DECISION:**

The representative's October 29, 2009 decision (reference 01) is reversed. The employer has not met its burden of proof to establish job-related misconduct. Benefits are allowed.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw