

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DAVID SHETLER

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-06390-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WELLS FARGO BANK NA

Employer

OC: 04-15-09

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a timely appeal from the April 15, 2009, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on May 20, 2009. The claimant did participate. The employer did not participate.

ISSUE:

Was the claimant discharged for work-related misconduct?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the testimony and all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a mortgage specialist full time beginning October 24, 2003 through March 5, 2009 when he was discharged.

On two separate occasions in February 2009 the claimant intentionally made deposits at an ATM machine into his bank account (held by his employer, Wells Fargo) and misrepresented the amount of his deposits in order to cover some of his bills. The claimant was dishonest with his employer about the amount of his deposits. The claimant indicated that more money had been deposited by him than was actually deposited so that the bank would cover his checks or payments out of his account.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

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.

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 claimant knew or should have known that he owed his employer honesty in dealing with his own account held by the employer. The claimant's falsification of deposit amounts in order to cover his debts is misconduct sufficient to disqualify him from receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The April 15, 2009, reference 01 decision is affirmed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/css