IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

DARREN L KITE

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-09525-S2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

OC: 11/09/08

Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.4-3 – Able and Available Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed from the May 1, 2013 (reference 06) representative's decision that found he was not able to work for the week ending April 20, 2013. A hearing was held by telephone conference call on August 27, 2013. The claimant did participate. Department's Exhibit D-1 was admitted to the record.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal was filed in a timely manner and, if so, whether the claimant was able and available for work.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was laid off for lack of work for the week ending April 20, 2013. He was not ill or in the hospital. The claimant was able to work.

A decision was mailed to the claimant's address of record on May 1, 2013. The claimant did not receive the decision.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the claimant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

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, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit 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 claimant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The claimant timely appealed the overpayment decision, which was the first notice of disqualification. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

The next issue is whether the claimant is able and available for work. The administrative law judge concludes he is.

871 IAC 24.23(1) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(1) An individual who is ill and presently not able to perform work due to illness.

When an employee is ill and unable to perform work due to that illness, he is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits. In this case there is no evidence that the claimant was ill or in any other way unable to work. The claimant is able for work for the week ending April 20, 2013.

DECISION:

The represer	ntative's May 1,	2013 decision	(reference	06) is reversed.	The appeal is	s considered
to be timely.	The claimant is	s able for work	for the wee	k ending April 2	0, 2013.	

Beth A. Scheetz

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/pjs