IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

EVELYN D NUNALEY

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-09438-ST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

DECISION

IAC IOWA CITY LLC

Employer

OC: 07/01/12

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed a department decision dated July 27, 2012 reference 01 that held he voluntarily quit without good cause attributable to her employer on July 3, 2012, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on August 29, 2012. The claimant participated. Teresa Feldman, assistant HR manager, participated for the employer. Claimant Exhibit A was received as evidence. Employer Exhibit 1 was received as evidence.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant filed a timely appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witness and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The department mailed the decision to claimant's address of record on July 27, 2012 with an appeal deadline date of August 6. The claimant spoke with a department representative about July 29, and she learned about the benefit denial decision. She was told to wait for the receipt of the decision, but she had ten days to appeal it. Claimant does not recall the date she received the decision in the mail, but she failed to note the appeal deadline date. She faxed the appeal to UI appeals on August 7.

Claimant worked for the employer from December 1, 2010 to July 3, 2012. She submitted a resignation letter to the employer on June 19 to be effective July 3. She moved with her husband, after the death of her father-in-law, to Mississippi. She had no intention of returning to employment and did not ask her job be held open.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code Section 96.6-2 provides in pertinent part:

The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum

duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. . . . Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. <u>Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.</u>, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); <u>Johnson v. Board of Adjustment</u>, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (lowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The lowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (lowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (lowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. Hendren v. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (lowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes the claimant failed to file a timely appeal.

The claimant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a more timely appeal by noting the deadline date and reading the appeal instructions. The claimant offered no good cause for the appeal delay.

DECISION:

rls/kjw

The department decision dated July 27, 2012, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant failed to file a timely appeal, and the department decision the claimant voluntarily quit without good cause on July 3, 2012 remains in force and effect. Benefits are denied until the claimant requalifies by working in and being paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	