

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**BRIAN P TRUB**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 06A-UI-09574-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**WAL-MART STORES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 08-06-06 R: 03**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated September 18, 2006 reference 03 that allowed benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for October 16, 2006. The appellant did respond to the hearing notice instructions but was not available when the hearing was called and did not participate in the hearing. The number provided by the employer rang busy every time the administrative law judge tried to call to begin the hearing. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the representative's decision should be affirmed.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to provide a telephone number at which a representative 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. When the administrative law judge tried to call the employer to participate in the hearing, the phone number provided constantly rang busy. The administrative law judge tried over five times to call the employer and waited until 1:10 p.m. to close the record. When the employer did not receive the call from the administrative law judge the employer should have called into the agency to determine why they had not been called. When a number rings busy repeatedly the administrative law judge has no way to contact the party.

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

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

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

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.

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 that prevented the appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

## **DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated September 18, 2006, reference 03 is affirmed. The representative's decision remains in effect.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs