Can Legal Marijuana Use Still Cost You a Job?

Forbes | Alonzo Martinez | March 26, 2026



getty

Legal marijuana use does not always translate into protection in the hiring process. A positive THC test can still carry consequences depending on the law where the job is located.

You apply for a job, move through the interview process, and receive a conditional offer. As part of onboarding, the employer runs a standard drug screen. The result comes back positive for THC.

You push back. Marijuana is legal where you live, at least under state law. You used it over the weekend. You were not impaired at work because you have not even started the job yet.

So, the question comes into focus quickly: can that result still cost you the job?

In many cases, the answer is yes. But the reason has less to do with legalization and more to do with how employment law treats off-duty conduct, workplace safety, and drug testing.

This scenario is becoming more common as marijuana laws continue to evolve. As more states legalize marijuana for medical or adult use, many workers assume that lawful use carries over into the hiring process. The legal reality is far more fragmented.

The better way to make sense of it is to step back and look at how state and local laws approach marijuana use and hiring along a spectrum.

Legalization Does Not Mean Employment Protection

Over the past decade, marijuana laws have shifted rapidly. Most states now permit some form of use, whether medical, recreational adult-use, or both. From a consumer perspective, the trend is clear.

But those changes have not always extended into the workplace. A substance that is lawful to use at home can still be disqualifying in the hiring process. Legalization answers one question, but employment law answers another.

In many jurisdictions, legalization simply removes criminal penalties. It does not limit an employer's ability to enforce drug-free workplace policies, conduct drug testing, or make hiring decisions based on the results of those tests. A positive THC result may still be treated the same way it was before legalization.

Federal law continues to play a role as well. Marijuana remains a Schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act. Employers subject to federal regulations, including those governed by the Department of Transportation, must continue to follow federal drug testing requirements regardless of state or local law.

At the same time, a growing number of jurisdictions have started to draw clearer lines. Some protect off-duty marijuana use. Others limit reliance on tests that detect cannabis metabolites, which are chemical traces left in the body after use that do not indicate current impairment.

As a result, a positive THC test may reflect past use, not current impairment, yet still carry consequences in the hiring process depending on the jurisdiction.

How State And Local Laws Influence Marijuana And Hiring Decisions

Rather than treating marijuana legalization as a single nationwide shift, it is more useful to think about employment protections as existing along a spectrum shaped by both state and local law.

At one end are jurisdictions that have begun to offer meaningful protections for lawful, off-duty use. These laws often limit when and how employers can take action based on a positive THC result, especially where there is no evidence of on-the-job impairment.

In the middle are jurisdictions that provide more limited or conditional protections. These may focus on medical marijuana users or require some level of accommodation, while still preserving employer discretion in safety-sensitive roles or where federal obligations apply.

At the other end are jurisdictions that have legalized marijuana in some form but have not extended those protections into the workplace. In these areas, employers generally retain broad discretion to test for marijuana and make hiring decisions based on the results.

Local ordinances can further shape how these rules apply. In some cities, employers face additional restrictions on pre-employment testing or must navigate requirements that go beyond state law.

Understanding where a jurisdiction falls along this spectrum is critical. Two candidates with identical drug test results can face very different outcomes depending not only on the state, but sometimes the city, where they apply for a job.

Those differences often determine how a positive THC result is treated in the hiring process.

Where Marijuana Testing Is Restricted

In some jurisdictions, a positive marijuana test will not automatically cost you a job, particularly if the use was off-duty and there is no evidence of impairment.

Some states go further and limit whether employers can test for marijuana at all as part of the hiring process. In places like New York and Minnesota, pre-employment THC testing is largely restricted, with exceptions for certain safety-sensitive roles and positions subject to federal requirements. In those jurisdictions, the issue may never arise for many candidates because employers are not permitted to rely on a traditional drug screen in the first place.

Other states take a different approach by focusing on how test results are used rather than whether testing occurs. California and Washington, for example, have moved away from allowing employers to rely on tests that detect non-psychoactive cannabis metabolites, which are chemical traces left in the body after marijuana use that do not indicate current impairment. These laws reflect a growing recognition that a positive result may say more about past use than current impairment, and they limit the extent to which that result can be used in hiring decisions.

Local ordinances can further shape the analysis. In cities like Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, employers are generally prohibited from conducting pre-employment marijuana testing for many roles, again with exceptions tied to safety and regulatory obligations. These local rules can create a different outcome even within states that have not adopted similar protections at the statewide level.

Even in these jurisdictions, the protection is not absolute. Employers typically retain the ability to act on evidence of on-the-job impairment and to enforce drug testing requirements where federal law or safety-sensitive duties apply. But as a practical matter, these laws significantly

reduce the likelihood that lawful, off-duty marijuana use will disqualify a candidate during the hiring process.

Where Marijuana Testing Is Limited But Still Allowed

In other jurisdictions, a positive marijuana test may still be part of the hiring process, but it does not always lead to an automatic disqualification.

Some states permit employers to test for marijuana but place limits on how a positive result can be used. In states like New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Montana, employers are generally restricted from taking adverse action based solely on a positive THC test, particularly where there is no evidence of impairment or another job-related concern. The result may trigger additional review rather than serve as a standalone basis for a hiring decision.

Others focus more directly on medical marijuana use. A number of states, including Illinois, Massachusetts, and Virginia, require employers to provide some level of accommodation for registered medical cannabis users, through an interactive dialogue. That often requires employers to consider whether the individual's lawful medical use can be addressed without affecting the role, rather than automatically disqualifying the candidate based on a positive test. These laws recognize lawful use in a medical context, but they still allow employers to act where accommodation would create a safety risk, conflict with federal obligations, or interfere with essential job functions.

For employers, this creates a more nuanced hiring framework. A positive result may no longer be enough on its own, but it can still be considered alongside other factors, including the nature of the role and workplace safety requirements.

The outcome becomes less predictable for workers. A positive marijuana test may not automatically end the hiring process, but it can still affect the result depending on how the employer evaluates the situation and what the law in that jurisdiction requires.

Where Employers Retain Broad Discretion

In many parts of the country, marijuana legalization has not meaningfully changed how employers approach hiring decisions.

In these jurisdictions, employers generally retain broad discretion to test for marijuana and to make employment decisions based on the results. A positive THC test, even if tied to lawful, off-duty use, can still result in a withdrawn offer or other adverse action.

This is often where the distinction between legalization and employment protection becomes most apparent. While state law may permit marijuana use, it does not limit an employer's ability to enforce drug-free workplace policies or to rely on drug testing as part of the hiring process.

That does not mean employers act without constraints. Federal requirements, industry standards, and internal policies still shape how testing is conducted and how results are used. But as a practical matter, the outcome in these jurisdictions is more predictable. A positive

marijuana test is more likely to be treated as a disqualifying factor, particularly in roles where safety, liability, or regulatory compliance are at issue.

Here, the outcome is more consistent. Legal use does not carry the same level of protection in the hiring process, and a positive test result can still have immediate consequences.

New Shift Toward Impairment-Based Approaches

As more jurisdictions revisit how marijuana use is treated in the workplace, a common theme has begun to emerge: a shift away from testing for past use and toward identifying on-the-job impairment.

Traditional drug testing methods, particularly urine tests, detect evidence of past marijuana use that can remain in the body for days or even weeks after use. As a result, a positive test may confirm prior consumption but does not establish that an individual was impaired at the time of the test or during working hours.

This limitation has started to shape how lawmakers and regulators approach marijuana in the employment context. In jurisdictions that have enacted stronger protections, the focus has moved toward whether an individual is impaired while performing job duties, rather than whether they have used marijuana at some point in the past. Some laws now limit reliance on metabolite-based testing altogether, while others require additional evidence of impairment before adverse action can be taken.

For employers, this shift introduces new challenges. Unlike alcohol, there is no widely accepted, standardized measure of marijuana impairment. Employers are often left to rely on observable signs, workplace policies, and supervisor training to assess whether an employee may be impaired on the job. Some jurisdictions have attempted to formalize this approach. New Jersey, for example, introduced the concept of a Workplace Impairment Recognition Expert to help employers identify potential impairment, though the practical implementation of that framework has remained a challenge.

For workers, the shift offers a measure of protection, but not certainty. Even in jurisdictions that emphasize impairment, employers may still take action where they believe job performance, safety, or compliance obligations are affected. The absence of a clear testing standard means that outcomes can still vary depending on how impairment is defined and enforced in practice.

This evolving focus on impairment reflects a broader attempt to reconcile two competing realities: the growing legalization of marijuana use and the continued need for employers to maintain safe and productive workplaces. How that balance is struck will continue to shape hiring practices in the years ahead.