

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TRENT J HUNTER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-07641-HT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WELLS FARGO BANK NA
Employer

**OC: 11/11/12
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5(1) – Quit
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant, Trent Hunter, filed an appeal from a decision dated January 16, 2013, reference 01. The decision disqualified him from receiving unemployment benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on September 9, 2013. The claimant participated on his own behalf. The employer, Wells Fargo, participated by Loan Administration Manager Cole Slaikeu and was represented by Barnett Associates in the person of Francis Landolfi. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into the record.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal is timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on January 16, 2013. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by January 26, 2013. The appeal was not filed until June 28, 2013, which is after the date noticed on the decision.

The claimant maintained he did not receive the decision but did receive a “bill” from Iowa Workforce Development stating he was overpaid. This was received sometime around the end of May 2013. He waited a week before going to his local Workforce Center to discuss the matter and was told he needed to file an appeal. He waited two more weeks before filing an appeal on June 28, 2013.

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. 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).

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 (Iowa 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 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. IDJS, 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. IDJS, 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. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The claimant waited three weeks from the date on which he was first aware he had been disqualified and was overpaid. This is not a timely action to appeal the issues.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated January 16, 2013, reference 01, is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect. The claimant is disqualified for unemployment benefits.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/css