

2001 WL 293237

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION.  
CHECK RULES BEFORE CITING.

Court of Appeals of Iowa.

William MARTIN, Alix Martin, and  
Scott Martin, Petitioners-Appellants,

v.

**MARSHALLTOWN** COMMUNITY  
SCHOOL DISTRICT and Iowa State Board  
of Education, Respondents-Appellees.

No. 00-154. | March 28, 2001.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Marshall  
County, William J. Pattinson, Judge.

The petitioners appeal from a district court ruling on  
judicial review affirming the department of education's  
decision prohibiting Scott Martin from participating  
in extra-curricular activities at his high school for  
violating the school district's **good conduct** policy.

AFFIRMED. APPEAL DISMISSED.

#### Attorneys and Law Firms

[Barry S. Kaplan](#) of Fairall, Fairall, Kaplan, Hoglan &  
Condon, **Marshalltown**, for appellants.

[John B. Grier](#) of Cartwright, Druker & Ryden,  
**Marshalltown**, for appellee school district.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, and Christie J.  
Scase, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee Iowa  
State Board of Education.

Considered by [HAYDEN](#), P.J., [HABHAB](#), S.J., and  
[PETERSON](#), S.J.\*

#### Opinion

[HAYDEN](#).

\*1 William, Alix and Scott Martin appeal from the  
district court's dismissal of their petition for judicial

review of a decision rendered by the Iowa State Board  
of Education on January 14, 1999. We affirm.

Scott Martin (Scott) was one of twenty-six  
**Marshalltown** High School (MHS) students who  
traveled to Germany from June 7, 1998, through June  
30, 1998. The purpose of the trip was to provide  
German language students with an experience with the  
German people and culture. Each student paid \$2,100  
to Ed-Ventures to go on this trip.

Robert Brinkman, a German teacher at MHS, arranged  
the trip. It was his ninth trip he had arranged  
through Ed-Ventures. He was paid by the company to  
chaperone and help make arrangements for the trip.  
He was not paid by MHS. Mr. Brinkman held two  
meetings with parents and students before the trip. He  
advised the students they could not drink or use drugs  
in Germany. If they did, they would be punished under  
the student's **good conduct** policy. The student **good  
conduct** policy recites in relevant parts as follows:

Participants in extra-curricular  
activities occupy leadership  
position, represent the school  
and the community and depict  
its character, all of which  
brings additional expectations  
and responsibilities. While the  
regular curricular program is  
a right afforded to each  
student, participation in the  
extra-curricular program is a  
privilege, and as such, carries  
certain expectations beyond  
those found in the normal, class  
room situation.

Scott participated in extra-curricular programs of  
cross-country track and played soccer for MHS.

Standard number two of the **good conduct** code is as  
follows:

The student shall at all times  
abstain from the consumption,  
possession, control, acquisition,  
delivery or transportation of  
beer, alcoholic beverages, or  
any controlled substances as

defined in the Iowa Code, as amended.

Mr. Brinkman obtained approval from the school district board for the trip for insurance purposes as he had done in previous years. The school district board's policy requires prior approval of all out-of-state school related trips. The school district claims the operation of the **good conduct** policy is not limited to school sponsored events and the status of the trip is irrelevant.

Several of the students while in Germany drank beer. Scott admitted to drinking beer. This was his third violation of the **good conduct** policy within one year. He was suspended from participating in all extra-curricular activities for one full year. In Germany it is legal to drink beer at the age of sixteen. Scott was seventeen years old at the time.

The administrative law judge and the State Board of Education affirmed the board of directors of the **Marshalltown** Community School District decision. The Martins petitioned for judicial review in the district court for Marshall county, Iowa. On January 7, 2000, the district court determined **Marshalltown** Community School District did not act unreasonably in precluding Scott from extra-curricular activities for a twelve month period and dismissed the petition for judicial review.

\*2 The Martins appealed the district court's decision to the Iowa Supreme Court and it has been transferred to this court for appellate decision.

### Scope of Review

Our scope of review is to correct errors of law. The district court, exercising the power of judicial review conferred by [Iowa Code section 17A.19 \(1997\)](#) is itself functioning in an appellate capacity to correct errors of law, as specified in [section 17A.19\(8\)](#). *Jackson County Public Hosp. v. Public Employment Relations Bd.*, 280 N.W.2d 426, 429 (Iowa 1979). Thus, when this court reviews a decision of a district court rendered pursuant to [section 17A.19](#), the sole question is whether the district court correctly applied the law. *Id.* In order to make that determination this court applies the standards of [section 17A.19\(8\)](#) to the agency action

to determine whether this court's conclusions are the same as those of the district court. *Id.* at 429-30.

### Mootness

When Scott testified at the November 1998 Administrative hearing he was an eighteen-year-old senior at MHS. At that hearing, MHS principal Jerry Stephens testified Scott was an excellent student. This court, like the district court feels safe in assuming Scott graduated in May of 1999. The school district argues any decision by this court cannot effect Scott's education or extra-curricular activities at **Marshalltown** High School. Therefore, this is a classic case of mootness. We agree.

The court will generally dismiss an appeal when the decision will have no practical legal effect upon the existing controversy. *Christiansen v. Iowa Dist. Court*, 578 N.W.2d 675, 679 (Iowa 1998). Scott has graduated from **Marshalltown** High School. Any decision by this court would have no legal effect upon his ability to participate in extra-curricular activities at the high school. This appeal is moot.

The Martins argue MHS's **good conduct** policy as it was applied to Scott is unreasonable. Even though this appeal is moot, we address their argument.

Scott understood the **good conduct** policy would apply to his **conduct** while on this trip. This was made clear to him before he left the United States. He also knew the **good conduct** policy prohibited him from consuming alcoholic beverages in violation of that policy would constitute his third offense within twelve months. In addition he knew the penalty for a third offense within twelve months was suspension for one full year of extra-curricular activities. He knew all of this before he decided to consume beer in Germany during the trip.

We observe Scott submitted himself to the authority of the school district and its **good conduct** policy before leaving on the trip. He participated in the trip knowing he was subject to the rules of the school district.

[1997 Iowa Code section 279.8](#) recites in part as follows:

The board shall make rules for its own government and that of the directors, officers, employees, teachers and pupils,....

Section 279.9 entitled Use of tobacco, alcoholic beverages, or controlled substances, provides:

\*3 The rules shall prohibit the use of tobacco and the use or possession of alcoholic liquor, wine, or beer or any controlled substance as defined in Section 124.101, subsection 5, by any student of the schools and the board may suspend or expel a student for a violation of a rule under this section.

The case of *Bunger v. Iowa High School Athletic Ass'n*, 197 N.W. 2d 555, 564 (Iowa 1972), acknowledged standout students in athletics play a somewhat different role from the rank and file. Leadership brings additional responsibility. These student leaders are looked up to and emulated. They represent the school and depict its character. We can not fault a school board for expecting somewhat more of them as to eligibility for their extra-curricular activities.

The *Bunger* court stated:

We have no doubt that school authorities may make a football player ineligible if he drinks beer during football season. No doubt such authorities may do likewise if the player drinks beer at other times during the school year or if he then possesses, acquires,

delivers, or transports beer. Probably a player shown to have actually violated beer laws during summer vacation, whether convicted in criminal court or not, can be rendered ineligible by school rules. All of these situations have direct bearing on the operation of the school....

*Bunger*, 197 N.W.2d at 564.

We determine the **good conduct** policy that prohibited the use of drugs or alcohol by Scott during the Summer of 1998 while he was in Germany is a reasonable exercise of the school board's authority.

Before leaving the United States on the trip to Germany Scott knew the **good conduct** policy would be in effect and he would be prohibited from consuming alcoholic beverages. He also knew if he consumed alcoholic beverages in violation of the **good conduct** policy it would constitute his third offense within twelve months. He was aware of the penalty for a third offense within twelve months was suspension for one full year. Scott knew all this before he decided to drink beer in Germany.

It was not unreasonable for the **Marshalltown** Community School District to suspend Scott from extra-curricular activities for twelve months. Scott had been punished for consuming alcoholic beverage twice before. We conclude MHS's **good conduct** policy applies to Scott in this case.

We affirm the district court and this appeal is dismissed. Costs are assessed to the appellants.

AFFIRMED. APPEAL DISMISSED.

#### Footnotes

\* Senior judges assigned by order pursuant to [Iowa Code section 602.9206 \(1999\)](#).