

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

TIM V WINNER

Claimant,

and

ALTER TRADING CORPORATION

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 15B-UI-00198

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

N O T I C E

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-A

D E C I S I O N

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board, one member dissenting, reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

DISSENTING OPINION OF KIM D. SCHMETT:

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the administrative law judge's decision. I would find that the Claimant disregarded instructions to remain at the testing facility when he immediately left and returned to work prior to full completion of the drug testing procedure. For this reason, I would conclude that the Employer satisfied their burden of proving job-disqualifying misconduct. Benefits should be denied until such time he has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. See, Iowa Code section 96.5(2)"a".

Kim D. Schmett

The Claimant submitted a written argument to the Employment Appeal Board. The Employment Appeal Board reviewed the argument. A portion of the argument consisted of additional evidence which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the argument and additional evidence were considered, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision.

Lastly, the Employer has requested this matter be remanded for a new hearing. The Employment Appeal Board finds the applicant did not provide good cause to remand this matter. Therefore, the remand request is **DENIED**.

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

AMG/fnv