

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ROYCE TURNER**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-07994-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WELLS FARGO BANK NA**

Employer

**OC: 06/02/13**

**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Royce Turner (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated July 5, 2013, reference 02, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from Wells Fargo Bank NA (employer) for work-related misconduct. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, an in-person hearing was scheduled for August 12, 2013 in Des Moines, Iowa. The employer submitted documentation that it would not be participating in the hearing. Consequently, the claimant elected to participate by telephone and the hearing was held on August 12, 2013.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct sufficient to warrant a denial of unemployment benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time personal banker from October 15, 2012 through June 6, 2013 when he was discharged for poor work performance. He had received disciplinary warnings and did show improvement but claimed he did not receive the proper training so was unable to complete all the duties of his job. The claimant completed the job to the best of his abilities.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

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 employer has the burden to prove the discharged employee is disqualified for benefits for misconduct. *Sallis v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 437 N.W.2d 895, 896 (Iowa 1989). The claimant was discharged on June 6, 2013 for poor work performance. When misconduct is alleged as the reason for the discharge and subsequent disqualification of benefits, it is incumbent upon the employer to present evidence in support of its allegations. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. 871 IAC 24.32(4). The employer did not participate in the hearing and failed to provide any evidence. The evidence provided by the claimant does not rise to the level of job misconduct as that term is defined in the above stated Administrative Rule. The employer failed to meet its burden. Work-connected misconduct has not been established in this case and benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated July 5, 2013, reference 02, is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/pjs