

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

COURTNEY L THOMAS

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-10442-HT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

APAC CUSTOMER SERVICES INC

Employer

OC: 07/28/13

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5(2)a – Discharge
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated September 3, 2013, reference 02, which concluded the claimant was qualified for unemployment benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for October 8, 2013. The appellant did not participate in the hearing. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the available administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

The appellant did not participate in the hearing. The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. As shown on the printout of the APLT screen labeled Exhibit D-1, there is no telephone number listed for the appellant. This proves that the appellant failed, prior to the hearing date and time, to provide a telephone number at which appellant could be reached for the hearing and did not participate for that reason. Furthermore, appellant did not request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice instructions.

ISSUE:

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to call the Appeals Section to provide a telephone number at which a witness could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. There is no evidence the hearing notice was returned by the postal service as undeliverable for any reason.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the available administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and the available administrative file and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

Pursuant to the rule, the appellant must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of this decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause which prevented the appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated September 3, 2013, reference 02, is affirmed. The decision finding the claimant qualified for benefits remains in effect.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/pjs