

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

PATRICK RACETTE
Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-08340-JC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT**

OC: 10/30/16
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal
Iowa Code § 96.6(1) – Filing Claims
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.2(1)h(1), (2) – Backdating

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the August 4, 2017, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision that denied the request to backdate the claim for benefits prior to July 16, 2017. After due notice was issued, a hearing was scheduled to be held by telephone conference call on September 1, 2017. Claimant participated. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Department Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Is the appeal timely?
May the claim be backdated prior to July 16, 2017?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant filed a claim for benefits with an effective date of December 30, 2016, and an additional claim date effective July 16, 2017, and desires to backdate the claim to July 9, 2017. The claimant attended apprenticeship training instead of work at Weitz Construction, for the week ending July 15, 2017 and failed to complete his weekly continued claim during the week he was unemployed.

The department has not failed to recognize the expiration of the claimant's previous benefit year and there is not an interstate claim against another state which has been determined as ineligible.

An initial unemployment insurance decision denying the request to backdate the claim was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on August 4, 2017. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by

August 14, 2017. He received the decision August 10 or 11, 2017 within the appeal period. The claimant also had an unrelated (for the reference 11 decision) fact-finding interview scheduled on August 8, 2017. The claimant stated he became confused by the decision and fact-finding interview but did not call IWD for guidance immediately. The appeal was not filed until August 15, 2017, which is after the date noticed on the unemployment insurance decision (Department Exhibit D-1).

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to address is whether the claimant filed a timely appeal. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal is untimely.

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, subsections 10 and 11, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit 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 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 claimant's confusion by having an unrelated fact-finding interview during the appeal period does not excuse the delay in filing his appeal. The administrative law judge concludes that his 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).

In the alternative, even if the appeal was deemed timely filed, the claimant's request for backdating would be denied.

Iowa Code section 96.6(1) provides:

1. Filing. Claims for benefits shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the department may prescribe.

Effective Wednesday, July 12, 2017, for claims effective July 16, 2017:

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.2(1)h(1) and (2) provide:

Procedures for workers desiring to file a claim for benefits for unemployment insurance.

(1) Section 96.6 of the employment security law of Iowa states that claims for benefits shall be made in accordance with such rules as the department prescribes. The department of workforce development accordingly prescribes:

h. Effective starting date for the benefit year.

(1) Filing for benefits shall be effective as of Sunday of the current calendar week in which, subsequent to the individual's separation from work, an individual files a claim for benefits.

(2) The claim may be backdated prior to the first day of the calendar week in which the claimant does report and file a claim for the following reasons:

1. The failure of the department to recognize the expiration of the claimant's previous benefit year;
2. The claimant filed an interstate claim against another state which has been determined as ineligible.

The October 2016 and June 2017, versions of the *Unemployment Insurance Benefits Handbook*, provides in pertinent part at pages 13 and 14:

CLAIM EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of all UI claims, regardless of filing method, will be the Sunday of the week in which the application was filed.

and

REACTIVATING A CLAIM

An individual can start and stop claiming weekly benefits as many times as necessary during the benefit year. This is called a break in reporting status. Any break in reporting requires the individual to file another initial claim application during the week he/she wants to start collecting benefits again. Any employment during the break must be reported.

Elsewhere in the June 17, 2017, version of the handbook at page 8, contact information includes days and hours for filing a claim and weekly claim reporting:

File a Claim

Hours: Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 4:30 pm

www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov

<https://uiclaims.iwd.iowa.gov/UIInitialClaim/>

Weekly Claim Reporting

Hours: Saturday 9:00 am through Sunday 11:30 pm

www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov

The claim filing information was not included in the October 2016, handbook.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.2(1)h(1) and (2) allows backdating for only the two reasons cited above. Neither of those reasons applies in this case. Accordingly, the backdating request must be denied.

DECISION:

The August 4, 2017, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal is untimely. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn