

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**MIGUEL A DIAZ**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 15A-UI-05423-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**SWIFT PORK COMPANY**

Employer

**OC: 02/08/15**

**Claimant: Respondent (6)**

Iowa Code § 17A.12(3) – Default Decision

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.14(7) – Dismissal of Appeal on Default

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed an appeal from the April 27, 2015, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on an Agency conclusion that the claimant was discharged on March 23, 2015 for no disqualifying reason. Notices of hearing were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record for a telephone hearing to be held at 2:00 p.m. on June 9, 2015. Claimant Miguel was available for the hearing. Spanish-English interpreter Olga Esparza was available to assist with the hearing. However, the employer representative, Stacey Santillan, was not available at the telephone number the employer had provided for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing. Based upon the employer/appellant's failure to participate in the hearing and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

**ISSUE:**

Should the appeal be dismissed based upon the employer/appellant not participating in the hearing?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The employer/appellant's representative, Stacey Santillan, was not available at the telephone number the employer provided for the hearing. The administrative law judge made three attempts to reach Ms. Santillan for the hearing. On each attempt, the call was eventually routed to Ms. Santillan's voice mailbox, where the administrative law judge left a message. As of entry of this decision at 3:45 p.m. on June 9, 2015, the employer has not responded to the messages left for the employer. The employer did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

The April 27, 2015, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and held the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on an Agency conclusion that the claimant was discharged on March 23, 2015 for no disqualifying reason.

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

The Iowa Administrative Procedures Act at Iowa Code § 17A.12(3) provides in pertinent part:

If a party fails to appear or participate in a contested case proceeding after proper service of notice, the presiding officer may, if no adjournment is granted, enter a default decision or proceed with the hearing and make a decision in the absence of the party. ... If a decision is rendered against a party who failed to appear for the hearing and the presiding officer is timely requested by that party to vacate the decision for good cause, the time for initiating a further appeal is stayed pending a determination by the presiding officer to grant or deny the request. If adequate reasons are provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall vacate the decision and, after proper service of notice, conduct another evidentiary hearing. If adequate reasons are not provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall deny the motion to vacate.

The Agency rules at Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.14(7) provide:

If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals bureau with the names and telephone numbers of the persons who are participating in the hearing by the scheduled starting time of the hearing or is not available at the telephone number provided, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing. If the appealing party fails to provide a telephone number or is unavailable for the hearing, the presiding officer may decide the appealing party is in default and dismiss the appeal as provided in Iowa Code section 17A.12(3). The record may be reopened if the absent party makes a request to reopen the hearing under subrule 26.8(3) and shows good cause for reopening the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire ex parte as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

The employer/appellant appealed the representative's decision but failed to participate in the hearing. The employer/appellant has therefore defaulted on its appeal pursuant to Iowa Code §17A.12(3) and Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.14(7), and the representative's decision remains in force and effect.

If the appellant disagrees with this decision, 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 end 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 April 27, 2015, reference 01, unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The decision that allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on March 23, 2015 separation, remains in effect.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
Iowa Workforce Development  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax 515-478-3528

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/pjs