## IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-00853-SWT **JACOB C BURBRIDGE** Claimant ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION WELLS FARGO BANK NA Employer

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated January 17, 2013, reference 01, that concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on February 18, 2013. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant participated in the hearing. John O'Fallon participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer with a witness, Derrick Beechum. Exhibit One was admitted into evidence at the hearing.

#### **ISSUE:**

Was the claimant discharged for work-connected misconduct?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant worked full time for the employer as a personal banker from February 20, 2012, to November 15, 2012. He did not received the employer's code of ethics and was put on the job without receiving training on the code of ethics, which states that employees are not allowed to reverse or waive fees or service charges on their own accounts. The claimant had never worked at a bank before.

The claimant was given the authority to waive fees or services charges using guidelines given to him. He had waived fees for other accounts. The claimant was a signer on a business account and under the guidelines, it was eligible for waive of fees. In November 2012, he waived the fees and did not know it was a violation of the code of ethics.

On November 15, 2012, the employer discharged the claimant for waiving the fees on the business account.

OC: 11/11/12

Claimant: Respondent (1)

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue in this case is whether the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law.

The unemployment insurance law disqualifies claimants discharged for work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a. The rules define misconduct as (1) deliberate acts or omissions by a worker that materially breach the duties and obligations arising out of the contract of employment, (2) deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of employees, or (3) carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design. 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 misconduct within the meaning of the statute. 871 IAC 24.32(1).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. <u>Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job</u> <u>Service</u>, 321 N.W.2d 6, 11 (Iowa 1982). The propriety of a discharge is not at issue in an unemployment insurance case. An employer may be justified in discharging an employee, but the employee's conduct may not amount to misconduct precluding the payment of unemployment compensation. The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. Lee v. Employment Appeal Board, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000).

While the employer may have been justified in discharging the claimant, work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has not been established. No willful and substantial misconduct has been proven in this case. The employer failed to prove the claimant knowingly violated the code of conduct.

#### **DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated January 17, 2013, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant is qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, if he is otherwise eligible.

Steven A. Wise Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

saw/pjs