

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

CHARLES C CASTLE
Claimant

APPEAL 18A-UI-09346-CL-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**CLEAR CREEK-AMANA COMM SCHOOL
DIS**
Employer

**OC: 07/01/18
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal
Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)i(1) – Benefit Eligibility - Substitute Workers
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)i(3) – Benefit Eligibility - On-call Wage Credits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the August 28, 2018, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon claimant's availability for work. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 27, 2018. Claimant participated. Employer participated through payroll secretary Melissa Potter. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received.

ISSUES:

Is the appeal timely?
Is the claimant able to and available for work?
Is the claimant still employed at the same hours and wages?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An unemployment insurance decision denying benefits based on claimant's availability for work was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on August 28, 2018. Claimant received the decision on September 3, 2018, within the appeal period. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by September 7, 2018. The appeal was not filed until September 8, 2018, which is after the date noticed on the unemployment insurance decision because claimant believed the corresponding overpayment decision extended the deadline for his appeal.

Claimant is employed as an on-call or as-needed substitute teacher. No certain number of hours is guaranteed. Claimant does not have sufficient base period wages from regular employment in his base period that would make him monetarily eligible for benefits.

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, 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. Bd. 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 unemployment insurance 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. 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).

Even if the appeal were to be considered timely, the administrative law judge concludes that the claimant is not considered to be unemployed and is therefore not eligible for benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(26) provides:

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

(26) Where a claimant is still employed in a part-time job at the same hours and wages as contemplated in the original contract for hire and is not working on a reduced workweek basis different from the contract for hire, such claimant cannot be considered partially unemployed.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)i(1) provides:

Benefit eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

i. On-call workers.

(1) Substitute workers (i.e., post office clerks, railroad extra board workers), who hold themselves available for one employer and who do not accept other work, are not available for work within the meaning of the law and are not eligible for benefits.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(2)i(3) provides:

Benefits eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

(2) Available for work. The availability requirement is satisfied when an individual is willing, able, and ready to accept suitable work which the individual does not have good cause to refuse, that is, the individual is genuinely attached to the labor market....

i. On-call workers.

(3) An individual whose wage credits earned in the base period of the claim consist exclusively of wage credits by performing on-call work, such as a banquet worker, railway worker, substitute school teacher or any other individual whose work is solely on-call work during the base period, is not considered an unemployed individual within the meaning of Iowa Code section 96.19(38)"a" and "b." An individual who is willing to accept only on-call work is not considered to be available for work.

The legislature has provided a specific rule that applies to substitute teachers holding that this category of worker, among others, is not considered to be unemployed within the meaning of the law when base period wage credits necessary to be monetarily eligible for benefits are related to "on-call" work. When an individual is hired to work "on-call" the implied agreement is that they will only work when work is available and that work will not be regularly available. Thus any diminution in hours is directly related to the sporadic availability of available work as no regular hours were guaranteed.

In this case, claimant is not monetarily eligible for benefits without wage credits earned as a substitute teacher. Claimant was hired to work as a substitute teacher with the understanding that hours would not be available regularly. Therefore, claimant is not considered unemployed during the summer term and benefits must be denied.

DECISION:

The August 28, 2018, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal is not timely. Even if it was, the claimant is not considered unemployed because of his on-call employment status in the wage credit history. Benefits are denied.

Christine A. Louis
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/scn