IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

KELVIN D CONLEY Claimant

APPEAL 16A-UI-10129-DGT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

MANPOWER INC OF D M

Employer

OC: 08/07/16 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 September 12, 2016, (reference 01) that held claimant eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a hearing was scheduled for and held on October 3, 2016. Employer participated by Becky White, Client Relations. Claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate.

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 11, 2016. Employer discharged claimant on March 22, 2016, because claimant failed a drug screening.

Claimant began working for employer on September 2, 2015. In March of 2016 claimant's assignment was ending, and employer had another assignment available at that time with a different employer. This employer assignment required a drug screening. Claimant submitted a sample on March 18, 2016. The results came back from the lab on March 22, 2016 and it appeared that claimant tested positive for cannabis. Claimant was sent a notice that his employment was terminated from this employer at that time.

The test results were not provided to claimant in writing delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested. They may have been sent by certified mail, but there was not a return receipt requested. The claimant was not offered a split sample test. The claimant was not referred for treatment but was discharged. No documentary evidence of a written drug screen policy was offered.

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. 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 return receipt requested, 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 employee 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 Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 602 N.W.2d 553, 557, 558 (Iowa 1999).

While the employer certainly was within its rights to test and fire the claimant, it failed to provide him sufficient notice of the test results, and an opportunity for a split sample test according to the strict and explicit statutory requirements. Claimant was not offered an opportunity to complete a substance abuse evaluation, and employer did not provide information to claimant about an employee assistance program or other substance abuse programs as required by lowa Code § 730.5(9)(c). Thus, the employer cannot use the results of the drug screen as a basis for disqualification from benefits and benefits are allowed.

DECISION:

The September 12, 2016, (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment for no disqualifying reason. Benefits are allowed, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Duane L. Golden Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/rv