

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

In the Matter of)	
Hailee T. Ray, an institution-affiliated party of)	
Herring Bank)	NOTICE OF INTENTION TO
Amarillo, Texas)	PROHIBIT FROM FURTHER
)	PARTICIPATION, NOTICE OF
(Insured State Nonmember Bank))	ASSESSMENT OF CIVIL MONEY
)	PENALTY, FINDINGS OF FACT
Respondent's NMLS UI# N/A)	AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
)	ORDER TO PAY, NOTICE OF
)	HEARING, and PRAYER FOR
)	RELIEF
)	
)	FDIC-24-0059e
)	FDIC-24-0060k
)	

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) determined that Hailee T. Ray (Respondent) was a bank teller at Herring Bank, Amarillo, Texas (Bank), and an institution-affiliated party (IAP) of the Bank. Respondent, directly or indirectly, engaged and participated in violations of law at the Bank, between approximately November 15, 2021 and December 30, 2021. Respondent's violations caused the Bank to suffer financial loss, and Respondent received financial gain. Respondent's violations also involved personal dishonesty.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO PROHIBIT FROM FURTHER PARTICIPATION

The FDIC issues this Notice of Intention to Prohibit from Further Participation and Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (collectively, Notice of Charges) under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e) and the FDIC Rules of Practice and Procedure, 12 C.F.R. part 308, subparts A and B. This proceeding will determine whether an order should be issued against Respondent under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e) to prohibit Respondent from further participation in the conduct of the

affairs of the Bank and any other insured depository institution or organization listed in 12 U.S.C. §1818(e)(7)(A) without the prior written approval of the FDIC and other appropriate Federal financial institutions regulatory agency.

NOTICE OF ASSESSMENT OF CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

The FDIC further issues this Notice of Assessment of Civil Money Penalty, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and Order to Pay (collectively, Notice of Assessment) under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2), and the FDIC Rules of Practice and Procedure, 12 C.F.R. part 308, subparts A and B. This proceeding assesses a \$35,000 civil money penalty against the Respondent under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2), unless the Respondent formally objects by timely requesting a hearing under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2)(H).

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The FDIC makes the following allegations against Respondent:

I. Jurisdiction

1. At all times described herein, the Bank was a corporation existing and doing business under the laws of the State of Texas with its principal place of business in Amarillo, Texas.

2. At all times described herein, the Bank was an insured State nonmember bank, subject to 12 U.S.C. §§ 1811-1831aa, 12 C.F.R. Chapter III, and the laws of the State of Texas.

3. At all times described herein, Respondent was employed as a bank teller at the Bank and continued to serve in that capacity until her termination from the Bank.

4. At all times described herein, Respondent was an “institution-affiliated party” of

the Bank under 12 U.S.C. § 1813(u) and for purposes of 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e)(7), 1818(i), and 1818(j).

5. The FDIC has jurisdiction over the Bank, Respondent, and the subject matter of this proceeding.

II. Facts of Respondent’s Violations of Law

6. At all the times described herein, Respondent was a bank teller at the Bank’s branch office in Grand Prairie, Texas.

7. Between November 15, 2021, and December 30, 2021, Respondent performed nine separate cash withdrawal transactions from an account owned by two elderly customers (Account Holders) of the Bank, withdrawing a total of \$39,950.

8. The dates and amounts of the withdrawal transactions were as follows:

Date	Amount
11/15/21	\$950
11/17/21	\$4,000
11/23/21	\$6,000
12/07/21	\$5,000
12/15/21	\$5,000
12/17/21	\$4,000
12/20/21	\$5,000
12/23/21	\$5,000

12/30/21	\$5,000
Total	\$39,950

9. Respondent performed the withdrawal transactions without the authorization of the Account Holders.

10. Respondent retained the withdrawn funds, in the amount of \$39,950, for her own financial benefit.

11. When the Account Holders discovered that funds had been withdrawn from their account, on January 12, 2022, they notified the Bank and stated that they had not authorized nor made the withdrawals themselves.

12. Following the reporting, the Bank initiated an investigation into the missing funds. Per its review of withdrawal slips and signature cards, the Bank determined it was Respondent who processed the withdrawal transactions.

13. When asked about the transactions by Bank personnel, Respondent stated that the Account Holders had made the withdrawals via the Bank's drive-thru lane.

14. Following a review of security footage which indicated no cars were present in the drive-thru lane at the time of the transactions, the Bank determined that Respondent's explanation was false.

15. The Bank determined that Respondent processed the transactions without customer authorization and misappropriated the funds herself.

16. On January 21, 2022, the Bank refunded \$39,966.95 to the Account Holders,

which included interest owed on the withdrawn funds.

17. On January 25, 2022, the Bank terminated Respondent's employment with the Bank.

18. In March 2022, Respondent was criminally charged in the Criminal District of Dallas County, Dallas, Texas, for the misconduct described above.

19. In August 2023, Respondent, having waived her right to a jury trial and entered guilty pleas, was convicted of Theft Greater Than \$30,000, Less Than \$150,000, Tex. Penal Code § 31.03(e)(4), a second-degree felony, and Exploitation of the Elderly, Tex. Penal Code § 31.03(f), a third-degree felony. Respondent received a suspended sentence and was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$38,500.

III. Conclusions of Law

20. Based on the misconduct described above, Respondent engaged in violations of law under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e) and (i)(2).

21. Respondent's practices described above resulted in financial loss to the Bank under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e) and (i)(2).

22. Respondent's practices described above resulted in Respondent's financial gain under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e) and (i)(2).

23. Respondent's practices described above demonstrate Respondent's personal dishonesty under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e).

24. Respondent's practices described above were part of a pattern of misconduct under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2).

ORDER TO PAY

Based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the FDIC determined that Respondent's violations of law merit a civil money penalty. After taking into account the appropriateness of the penalty with respect to the following mitigating factors under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2)(G): size of the Respondent's financial resources and good faith, the gravity of the violations, the history of previous violations, and such other matters as justice may require, it is:

ORDERED that by reason of Respondent's violations listed above, a \$35,000 penalty is assessed against Hailee T. Ray under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2).

FURTHER ORDERED that the Order to Pay is stayed until 20 days after the date of service of this Notice of Assessment to allow Respondent time to object to the Order to Pay.

If Respondent wants to object to the Order to Pay, Respondent must formally request a hearing in writing within 20 calendar days after service of this Notice of Assessment, as explained at 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2)(H). Respondent may object to the Order to Pay by requesting a hearing in a formal Answer, as specified in 12 C.F.R. § 308.19. **If Respondent fails to request a hearing to object to the Order to Pay within 20 calendar days from the date of service of this Notice of Assessment, the penalty assessed against Respondent will be final and unappealable under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(E)(ii) and 12 C.F.R. § 308.19(c)(2), and must be paid within 60 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice of Assessment.**

NOTICE OF HEARING

Respondent must file an Answer to object to the Notice of Charges within 20 days from the date of service under 12 C.F.R. § 308.19. Respondent may file one document containing both the Answer to the Notice of Charges, and a request for hearing on the Order to Pay. The hearing will be held before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) assigned by Office of Financial Institution Adjudication (OFIA) under 5 U.S.C. § 3105. The hearing on the Notice of Charges will begin on a date set by the ALJ in Dallas, Texas, or in another location set by the ALJ. The hearing will be public and conducted in accordance with 12 U.S.C. §§ 1811-1831aa, the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551-559, and 12 C.F.R. part 308, subparts A and B.

An original and one copy of all papers filed in this proceeding must be served upon OFIA, 3501 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite VS-D8116, Arlington, VA 22226-3500, in the manner specified at 12 C.F.R. § 308.10. Also, copies of all papers filed in this proceeding must be served upon the following: FDIC Administrative Officer, 550 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20429; Seth P. Rosebrock, Assistant General Counsel, Enforcement Section, Legal Division, FDIC, 550 17th Street, N.W. 2nd Floor, Washington, D. C. 20429; Shirley Huang, Senior Counsel, Enforcement Section, Legal Division, 550 17th Street N.W. 2nd Floor, Washington, DC 20429; and Regional Counsel Stephen C. Zachary, FDIC, Dallas Regional Office, 600 North Pearl Street, Suite 700, Dallas, TX 75201. Respondent is encouraged to file any subsequent documents electronically with OFIA at ofia@fdic.gov.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The FDIC prays that an Order of Prohibition from Further Participation under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(e) and an Order to Pay in the amount of \$35,000 and assessed under 12 U.S.C. § 1818(i)(2), be issued against Hailee T. Ray.

Issued under delegated authority.

Dated: April 30, 2026.

/s/ _____
Ryan Billingsley
Director
Division of Risk Management Supervision