



Marijuana Policy Project  
P.O. Box 77492  
Washington, DC 20013  
p: (202) 462-5747 • f: (202) 232-0442  
info@mpp.org • www.mpp.org

*"We change laws."*

## Medical Marijuana Laws and Civil Protections

This chart reviews medical marijuana laws' language that *may* support claims for civil protections, such as protections from discrimination in housing, employment, child custody cases, or enrollment in a college. It also includes known court cases related to civil protections and explicit limitations on those protections in the laws. In addition to the medical marijuana laws' text, other state laws may provide some civil protections, and those are generally not discussed in this memo. This chart does not include information about protections for physicians.

State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
Alaska	None known.	Alaska Stat. § 17.37.030 (b) "Except as otherwise provided by law, a person is not subject to arrest, prosecution, or penalty in any manner for applying to have the person's name placed on the confidential registry maintained by the department under AS 17.37.010."	Alaska Stat. § 17.37.030 (d) "Nothing in this chapter requires any accommodation of any medical use of marijuana (1) in any place of employment ..."
Arizona	None known.	Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 36-2811 (B) says registered patients and caregivers are not "subject to ... penalty in any manner, or denial of any right or privilege, including any civil penalty or disciplinary action by a court or occupational or professional licensing board ..." for the permissible conduct. § 36-2813 prohibits discrimination by schools, landlords, and employers, as well as discrimination in respect to organ transplants, other medical care, and custody and visitation, unless an exception applies. Employers generally cannot penalize patients for a positive drug test for marijuana "unless the patient used, possessed or was impaired by marijuana at or during work." Per §36-2805, nursing homes, assisted living centers, and similar facilities generally "may not unreasonably limit a registered qualifying patients' access to or use of marijuana authorized under this chapter."	The prohibitions on discrimination by employers, landlords, schools, and assisted living facilities do not apply if "failing to [penalize the cardholder] would cause the [entity] to lose a monetary or licensing related benefit under federal law or regulations." The law also does not allow anyone to undertake "any task under the influence of marijuana when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice." HB 2541 (2011) allows employers to take actions based on "good faith" beliefs about employee impairment. HB 2349 (2012) bans the use of marijuana on college campuses and vocational schools. The restrictions the legislature passed might be challenged as illegal meddling with an initiative under the Voter Protection Act.

**NOTE: This is not intended for or offered as legal advice. It is for informational and educational purposes only.**

*Updated September 2014*

State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
<b>California</b>	In <i>Ross v. Ragingwire</i> , the state Supreme Court ruled that the law does not protect patients from firing for testing positive for metabolites. It noted that the legislature could enact such protections. The legislature did so in 2008, passing AB 2279, but the bill was vetoed.	In the introduction, voters declared their intent “[t]o ensure that seriously ill Californians have the right to obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes” and to “ensure that patients and their primary caregivers who obtain and use marijuana for medical purposes upon the recommendation of a physician are not subject to criminal prosecution or sanction.” (Calif. Health & Safety Code § 11362.5 (b))	Calif. Health & Safety Code § 11362.785 (a) provides “Nothing in this article shall require any accommodation of any medical use of marijuana on the property or premises of any place of employment or during the hours of employment or on the property or premises of any jail, correctional facility, or other type of penal institution in which prisoners reside or persons under arrest are detained.”
<b>Colorado</b>	The Colorado Court of Appeals ruled against a medical marijuana patient who was denied unemployment after he was fired for testing positive for marijuana. ( <i>Beinor v. Industrial Claim Appeals Office</i> ). In April 2013, it also ruled against Brandon Coats, a paralyzed patient who sued DISH for terminating him for off-hours medical marijuana use.	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 25-1.5-106 (8) says “the use of medical marijuana is allowed under state law” to the extent it is carried out in accordance with the state constitution, statutes, and regulations. Patients and caregivers may be protected by the state’s “Lawful Off-Duty Activities Statute,” which protects employees from being penalized for legal outside-of-work behavior.	Col. Const. Art. XVIII, § 14. (10) (b) specifies “Nothing in this section shall require any employer to accommodate the medical use of marijuana in any work place.”
<b>Connecticut</b>	None known.	The law says patients and caregivers should not be “denied any right or privilege, including, but not limited to, being subject to any disciplinary action by a professional licensing board” for the permitted conduct. It also includes protections from discrimination based on one’s status as a patient or caregiver by landlords, employers, and schools.	The protections from discrimination by landlords, schools, and employers include an exception for if it is “required by federal law or required to obtain federal funding.” The law does not “restrict an employer’s ability to discipline an employee for being under the influence of intoxicating substances during work hours.” Patients cannot use marijuana on any school grounds, including in dorms or other college property.

State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
<b>Delaware</b>	None known.	16 Del. Code §4903A (a-b) says registered patients and caregivers are not “subject to ... denial of any right or privilege, including but not limited to civil penalty or disciplinary action by a court or occupational or professional licensing board or bureau ...” for the permissible conduct. §4905A (a-b) prohibits discrimination by schools, landlords, and employers, as well as discrimination in respect to organ transplants, other medical care, and custody or visitation, unless an exception applies. Employers generally cannot penalize patients for a positive drug test for marijuana unless the patient “used, possessed, or was impaired by marijuana on the premises of the place of employment or during the hours of employment.”	16 Del. Code §4904(A) and 4905A (a-b) provide limitations on the protections. The prohibitions on discrimination by employers, landlords, and schools do not apply if “failing to [penalize the cardholder] would cause the [entity] to lose a monetary or licensing-related benefit under federal law or regulation.” §4904A (a) provides that the chapter does not allow anyone to undertake “any task under the influence of marijuana, when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice.”
<b>District of Columbia</b>	None known.	D.C. Code § 7-1671.02 provides “(a) Notwithstanding any other District law, a qualifying patient may possess and administer medical marijuana, and possess and use paraphernalia, in accordance with this act and the rules issued pursuant to section 14.”	D.C. Code § 7-1671.03.says “Nothing in this act permits a person to: (1) Undertake any task under the influence of medical marijuana when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice ...”
<b>Hawaii</b>	None known.	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 329-122 states: “Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the medical use of marijuana by a qualifying patient shall be permitted only if: ...”	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 329-122 (c) provides: “The authorization for the medical use of marijuana in this section shall not apply to: ... (2) The medical use of marijuana: ... (B) In the workplace of one’s employment ... ”
<b>Illinois</b>	None known.	Schools, employers, and landlords cannot refuse to enroll, lease to, or otherwise penalize someone for his or her status as a registered patient or caregiver, unless failing to do so would create an issue with federal law, contracts, or licensing. (Sec. 40, HB 1, 2013). Patients' authorized use of marijuana cannot disqualify a person from receiving organ transplants or other medical care and will not result in the denial of custody or parenting time, unless the patient’s actions created an unreasonable danger to the minor's safety. (Sec. 40)	Landlords may prohibit the smoking of cannabis on the rented premises. (Sec. 40) Schools, employers, and landlords, may penalize a person for their status as a patient or caregiver if "failing to do so would put the school, employer, or landlord in violation of federal law or unless failing to do so would cause it to lose a monetary or licensing-related benefit under federal law or rules." (Sec. 40) The law does not "prohibit an employer from enforcing a policy concerning drug testing, zero-tolerance, or a drug free workplace provided the policy is applied in a nondiscriminatory manner." (Sec. 50, which also includes other limitations on employers' liability.)

State	Court Cases Or Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
<b>Maine</b>	In early 2013, the ACLU of Maine filed suit on behalf of Brittany Thomas, a patient who was fired from Adecco Group North America after testing positive for marijuana. The case is still pending.	Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 22, § 2423-E provides that persons whose conduct is authorized by the law “may not be denied any right or privilege or be subjected to arrest, prosecution, penalty or disciplinary action.” It also provides, “A school, employer, or landlord may not refuse to enroll or employ or lease to or otherwise penalize a person solely for that person's status as a qualifying patient or a primary caregiver” unless an exception applies. It provides, “A person may not be denied parental rights and responsibilities with respect to or contact with a minor child ...” unless the person’s behavior is contrary to the best interests of the child.	The protections from discrimination by employers, landlords, and schools do not apply if “failing to [penalize the person] would put the school, employer, or landlord in violation of federal law or cause it to lose a federal contract or funding.” Maine’s law also does not prohibit a restriction “on the administration or cultivation of marijuana on [rented] premises when that administration or cultivation would be inconsistent with the general use of the premises.” It “does not permit any person to: Undertake any task under the influence of marijuana when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice or would otherwise violate any professional standard ...” The law does not require “An employer to accommodate the ingestion of marijuana in any workplace or any employee working while under the influence of marijuana.”
<b>Maryland</b>	None known.	Md. Code Ann. § 13-3313 protects qualifying patients, caregivers, certifying physicians, licensed growers, licensed dispensaries, academic medical centers, those entities’ staff, and hospitals or hospices that are treating a qualifying patient from “any civil or administrative penalty, including a civil penalty or disciplinary action by a professional licensing board, or be denied any right or privilege” when acting in accordance with the law.	Md. Code Ann. § 13-3314(a)(1) provides that the law does not allow anyone to “[undertake] any task under the influence of marijuana, when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice.” § 13-3314(a)(5) allows landlords and condominiums to restrict marijuana smoking.
<b>Massachusetts</b>	None known.	Sec. 1 provides, “The citizens of Massachusetts intend that there should be no punishment under state law for qualifying patients, physicians and health care professionals, personal caregivers for patients, or medical marijuana treatment center agents for the medical use of marijuana, as defined herein.” The law also says that persons meeting its requirements shall not be “penalized under Massachusetts law in any manner, or denied any right or privilege.”	Sec. 7 provides, “Nothing in this law requires any accommodation of any on-site medical use of marijuana in any place of employment, school bus or on school grounds, in any youth center, in any correctional facility, or of smoking medical marijuana in any public place.”

State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
Michigan	On Sept. 19, 2012, the federal appellate court for the sixth district ruled against sinus cancer survivor Joe Casias, who sued Wal-Mart for terminating his employment for failing a drug test.	Mich. Comp. Laws § 333.26424 (a) provides that those abiding by the act cannot be subject to “arrest, prosecution, or penalty in any manner, or denied any right or privilege, including but not limited to civil penalty or disciplinary action by a business or occupational or professional licensing board or bureau” for actions allowed by the law. Sec. 4 (c) provides, “A person shall not be denied custody or visitation of a minor for acting in accordance with this act, unless the person's behavior is such that it creates an unreasonable danger to the minor that can be clearly articulated and substantiated.”	Mich. Comp. Laws § 333.26424 provides “(b) This act shall not permit any person to do any of the following: ... (1) Undertake any task under the influence of marihuana, when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice. ... (c) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require: ... (2) An employer to accommodate the ingestion of marihuana in any workplace or any employee working while under the influence of marihuana.”
Minnesota	None known.	Minn. Code Ann. § 152.32 subd. 3 provides that unless an exception applies, an individual's status as a registered medical marijuana patient may not be used: 1) by schools as a reason to refuse enrollment; 2) by landlords as reason to refuse to lease to the person; 3) by employers as a reason to refuse to hire or as a reason to terminate employment; or 4) as a reason to deny custody or visitation rights. An employer generally cannot discriminate against a patient based on a failed drug test for marijuana.	The law does not require accommodation if it would violate federal law or regulations, or cause the entity to lose a federal licensing or monetary benefit. Employers may punish patients if they are impaired at work or possess marijuana at work. In addition, Minn. Code Ann. § 152.23 provides that patients may face civil penalties for undertaking a task under the influence of marijuana that would constitute negligence or professional malpractice.
Montana	In 2009, the Montana Supreme Court upheld the dismissal of a patient who tested positive for marijuana metabolites in <i>Johnson v. Columbia Falls Aluminum</i> . The decision is a memorandum opinion, and is not binding precedent on other cases.	Mont. Code Ann. § 50-46-201 provides that those abiding by the act “may not be arrested, prosecuted, or penalized in any manner or be denied any right or privilege, including but not limited to civil penalty or disciplinary action by a professional licensing board or the department of labor and industry” for the medical use of marijuana in accordance with the act.	The law does not require employers to accommodate medical marijuana use, a school to allow patients to participate in extracurricular activities, or a landlord to allow medical marijuana cultivation or use. Employers may prohibit medical marijuana, and it does not provide a cause of action for discrimination. Cultivate requires the landlord's written permission. (Mont. Code Ann. § 50-46-320 and 50-46-307)

State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
Nevada	None known.	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 453A.510 “A professional licensing board shall not take any disciplinary action against a person licensed by the board” for engaging in the medical use of marijuana or acting as a caregiver. An employer must “attempt to make reasonable accommodations for the medical needs of an [employee who is a registered patient] provided that such reasonable accommodation would not: (a) Pose a threat of harm or danger to persons or property or impose an undue hardship on the employer; or (b) Prohibit the employee from fulfilling any and all of his or her job responsibilities.” § 453A.800	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 453A.800 “The provisions of this chapter do not: ... Require any employer to allow the medical use of marijuana in the workplace. 3. Require an employer to modify the job or working conditions of a person who engages in the medical use of marijuana that are based upon the reasonable business purposes of the employer ...” with the limitations listed in the previous column.
New Hampshire	None known.	"For the purposes of medical care, including organ transplants, a qualifying patient's authorized use of cannabis in accordance with this chapter shall be considered the equivalent of the authorized use of any other medication used at the direction of a provider, and shall not constitute the use of an illicit substance." (N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. 126-W:2 (VII)) “A person otherwise entitled to custody of, or visitation or parenting time with, a minor shall not be denied such a right solely for conduct allowed under this chapter, and there shall be no presumption of neglect or child endangerment.” (RSA 126-W:2 (VII))	“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to require: ... Any accommodation of the therapeutic use of cannabis on the property or premises of any place of employment ... This chapter shall in no way limit an employer's ability to discipline an employee for ingesting cannabis in the workplace or for working while under the influence of cannabis.” (N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. 126-W:3 (III))



State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
New Jersey	None known.	N.J. Rev. Stat. § 24:6I-2 (e) states "... the purpose of this act is to protect from arrest, prosecution, property forfeiture, and criminal and other penalties, those patients who use marijuana to alleviate suffering from debilitating medical conditions, as well as their physicians, primary caregivers, and those who are authorized to produce marijuana for medical purposes." § 24:6I-6 (b) provides that patients, caregivers, and others acting in accordance with the law "shall not be subject to any civil or administrative penalty, or denied any right or privilege, including, but not limited to, civil penalty or disciplinary action by a professional licensing board, related to the medical use of marijuana."	N.J. Rev. Stat. § 24:6I-14 "Nothing in this act shall be construed to require ... an employer to accommodate the medical use of marijuana in any workplace."
New Mexico	In August 2014, a physician's assistant named Donna Smith filed suit against Presbyterian Healthcare Services after she was reportedly fired for testing positive for marijuana. The case has not been decided..	N.M. Stat. § 26-2B-4 (4) (a) provides that qualified patients "shall not be subject to arrest, prosecution or penalty in any manner for the possession of or the medical use of cannabis if the quantity of cannabis does not exceed an adequate supply."	N.M. Stat. § 26-2B-5(A) "Participation in a medical use of cannabis program by a qualified patient or primary caregiver does not relieve the qualified patient or primary caregiver from: ... (3) criminal prosecution or civil penalty for possession or use of cannabis: ... (c) in the workplace of the qualified patient's or primary caregiver's employment ..."
New York	None known.	Patients, caregivers, and dispensaries' staff may not be "subject to arrest, prosecution, or penalty in any manner, or denied any right or privilege, including but not limited to civil penalty or disciplinary action by a business or occupational or professional licensing board or bureau" for actions allowed by the medical marijuana law. Being a medical marijuana patient is considered a disability for purposes of the state's anti-discrimination laws. Finally, patients are protected from discrimination in family law and domestic relations cases. (N.Y. Pub. Health § 3369)	N.Y. Public Health Law Art. 33 Title 5-A Section 3362 provides that "possession of medical marihuana shall not be lawful under this title if it is smoked, consumed, vaporized, or grown in a public place."  "A certified medical use does not include smoking." (N.Y. Public Health Law Art. 33 Title 5-A Section 3360)

State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
Oregon	In April 2010, the Oregon Supreme Court ruled in <i>Emerald Steel v. BOLI</i> that patients are not protected from being fired for testing positive for metabolites.	Or. Rev. Stat. § 475.302 (10) reads “Registry identification card” means a document issued by the authority that identifies a person authorized to engage in the medical use of marijuana and the person’s designated primary caregiver, if any.” § 475.328 “(1) No professional licensing board may impose a civil penalty or take other disciplinary action against a licensee based on the licensee’s medical use of marijuana in accordance with the provisions of ORS 475.300 to 475.346 or actions taken by the licensee that are necessary to carry out the licensee’s role as a designated primary caregiver to a person who possesses a lawful registry identification card.”	Or. Rev. Stat. provides § “Nothing in ORS 475.300 to 475.346 shall be construed to require: ... (2) An employer to accommodate the medical use of marijuana in any workplace.”
Rhode Island	None known.	R.I. Gen. Laws § 21-28.6-4 (a) and (c) provide that patients and caregivers abiding by the act “shall not be subject to arrest, prosecution, or penalty in any manner, or denied any right or privilege, including but not limited to, civil penalty or disciplinary action by a business or occupational or professional licensing board or bureau” for the medical use of marijuana. § 21-28.6-4 (c) provides, “No school, employer, or landlord may refuse to enroll, employ, or lease to or otherwise penalize a person solely for his or her status as a cardholder.” § 21-28.6-4 (n) provides, “For the purposes of medical care, including organ transplants, a registered qualifying patient’s authorized use of marijuana shall be considered the equivalent of the authorized use of any other medication used at the direction of a physician, and shall not constitute the use of an illicit substance.”	R.I. Gen. Laws § 21-28.6-7 states “(a) This chapter shall not permit: (1) Any person to undertake any task under the influence of marijuana, when doing so would constitute negligence or professional malpractice ...” and “(b) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to require: ... (2) An employer to accommodate the medical use of marijuana in any workplace.”



State	Court Decisions	Language Most Relevant to Civil Protections	Limitations Related to Civil Protections
Vermont	None known.	The explicit patient and caregiver protections in the medical marijuana law are from criminal penalties, “A person who has in his or her possession a valid registration card issued pursuant to this subchapter and who is in compliance with the requirements of this subchapter ... shall be exempt from arrest or prosecution under subsection 4230(a) of this title.” (Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 18, § 4474b.)	Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 18, § 4474c. provides “(a) This subchapter shall not exempt any person from arrest or prosecution for: (1) Being under the influence of marijuana while: ... (B) in a workplace or place of employment; or ... (2) The use or possession of marijuana by a registered patient or a registered caregiver: ... (B) in a manner that endangers the health or well-being of another person.”
Washington	In <i>Roe v. Teletech Customer Care Management</i> , the Washington State Supreme Court ruled in favor of an employer who was sued after terminating a medical marijuana patient. The ruling was issued on June 9, 2011.	Medical marijuana cannot be the “sole disqualifying factor” for an organ transplant unless it could cause rejection or organ failure, though a patient could be required to abstain before or during the transplant. (Wash. Rev. Code § 69.51A.110) The law also limits when parental rights and residential time can be limited due to the medical use of marijuana. (§ 69.51A.120)	“Nothing in this chapter requires any accommodation of any on-site medical use of cannabis in any place of employment, in any school bus or on any school grounds, in any youth center, in any correctional facility, or smoking cannabis in any public place or hotel or motel.” (Wash. Rev. Code § 69.51A.060(4).) An employer explicitly does not have to accommodate medical marijuana if it establishes a drug-free workplace. (§ 69.51A.060 (6))