

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**JOLEEN M FIRST**  
Claimant

**APPEAL 18A-UI-02724-JC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 02/14/16  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Overpayment of Benefits  
Iowa Code § 96.16(4) – Offenses and Misrepresentation  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-25.1 – Misrepresentation & Fraud

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the January 5, 2018 (reference 01) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision which concluded the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant incorrectly reported, or failed to report, earnings from Adecco between February 14, 2016 and July 30, 2016. IWD also imposed a 15% administrative penalty due to misrepresentation.

The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 28, 2018. The claimant, Joleen M. First, participated personally. Rick McGee, husband of claimant, attended as an observer. Kevan Irvine, Workforce Program Coordinator, participated on behalf of IWD. Claimant Exhibit A and IWD Exhibits 1-9 were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant’s unemployment insurance benefits records. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUES:**

Is the appeal timely?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of February 14, 2016. An initial unemployment insurance decision (Reference 01) resulting in overpayment and the imposition of an administrative penalty was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on January 5, 2018. She received the decision within the appeal period. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by January 15, 2018. Because the final day to appeal was a holiday, the deadline was extended to January 16, 2018. The appeal was not filed until February 23, 2018, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision (Claimant Exhibit A).

The claimant received the initial decision within the prescribed period to appeal but delayed filing her appeal because she wanted to formulate a “thoughtful” and adequate appeal (Claimant Exhibit A.) The claimant did not contact IWD for guidance about the appeal process within the prescribed period to appeal.

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

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant’s appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. 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. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsections 10 and 11, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs “a” through “h”. 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

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. *Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Board of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

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 Iowa 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 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. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. In this case, the claimant failed to file her appeal within the prescribed period because she wanted to take time to file a thoughtful and adequate appeal. She did not contact IWD during the prescribed appeal period for any guidance. The claimant delayed filing her appeal approximately five weeks after the January 16, 2018 deadline. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes that failure to follow the clear written instructions to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See, *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

**DECISION:**

The January 5, 2018, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

---

Jennifer L. Beckman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn