

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**KAYLEE N RODGERS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-05493-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WELLS FARGO BANK**  
Employer

**OC: 04/01/12**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Kaylee Rodgers (claimant) appealed a representative's May 1, 2012 decision (reference 01) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she was discharged from work with Wells Fargo Bank (employer) for violation of a known company rule. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for June 6, 2012. The claimant participated personally. The employer was represented by Kelley Landolphi, hearing representative, and participated by Charles Minson, manager.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was separated from employment for any disqualifying reason.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was hired on July 13, 2009, and at the end of her employment she was working as a part-time loan servicing specialist. The claimant signed for receipt of the employer's handbook on July 13, 2009. The employer issued the claimant written warnings on September 12, 2011, and April 4, 2012, for attendance.

On March 24, 2012, the claimant arrived for work at 8:30 a.m. She recorded on her time card that she arrived at 7:00 a.m. The employer discovered the error on March 26, 2012, and investigated. The employer terminated the claimant on April 4, 2012, for falsification of her time record.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Iowa Code section 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.

871 IAC 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.

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). As persuasive authority, the falsification of an activity log book constitutes job misconduct. Smith v. Sorensen, 222 Nebraska 599, 386 N.W.2d 5 (1986). The claimant clearly disregarded the standards of behavior that an employer has a right to expect of its employees. The claimant's actions were volitional. She intentionally recorded the wrong time on her time card. When a claimant intentionally disregards the standards of behavior that the employer has a right to expect of its employees, the claimant's actions are misconduct. The claimant was discharged for misconduct.

**DECISION:**

The representative's May 1, 2012 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, because the claimant was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until the claimant has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/kjw