# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**KEVIN D BARROW** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-04323-VST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

LABOR READY MIDWEST INC

Employer

OC: 1/20/12

Claimant: Appellant (2)

871 IAC 24.26(19) – Spot Labor Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated February 26, 2013, reference 02, which held claimant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on May 20, 2013. Claimant participated. The employer notified the agency in writing that it would not be participating in the hearing. The record consists of the testimony of Kevin Barrow. Official notice is taken of agency records.

#### ISSUE:

Whether the claimant filed a timely appeal.

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witness and having considered all of the evidence in the record, makes the following findings of fact:

On February 26, 2013, a representative issued a decision that held that the claimant was ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. The decision also states that the decision would become final unless an appeal was postmarked by March 8, 2013, or received by the Appeals Section on that date. The claimant's appeal was filed on April 10, 2013. The claimant did not receive a copy of the decision because he had moved to California and the postal service did not forward his mail.

The claimant worked for the employer for one day in June of 2012. He went each day to the employer's office and signed up for work. He then waited to see if any jobs were available. He worked three to four hours putting up a fence. He went back to the employer several times and never received another assignment.

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

The preliminary issue in this case is whether the claimant timely appealed the representative's decision. Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides that unless the affected party (here, the claimant) files an appeal from the decision within ten calendar days, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied as set out by 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. <u>Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.</u>, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); <u>Johnson v. Board of Adjustment</u>, 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 lowa 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 not have a reasonable opportunity to file an appeal postmarked as timely because he never received a copy of the decision.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to have the appeal timely postmarked within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was due to error, misinformation, delay, or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to 871 IAC 24.35(2). The appeal will be deemed timely.

# 871 IAC 24.26(19) provides:

Voluntary quit with good cause attributable to the employer and separations not considered to be voluntary quits. The following are reasons for a claimant leaving employment with good cause attributable to the employer:

(19) The claimant was employed on a temporary basis for assignment to spot jobs or casual labor work and fulfilled the contract of hire when each of the jobs was completed. An election not to report for a new assignment to work shall not be construed as a voluntary leaving of employment. The issue of a refusal of an offer of suitable work shall be adjudicated when an offer of work is made by the former employer. The provisions of lowa Code section 96.5(3) and rule 24.24(96) are controlling in the determination of suitability of work. However, this subrule shall not apply to substitute school employees who are subject to the provisions of lowa Code section 96.4(5) which denies benefits that are based on service in an educational institution when the individual declines or refuses to accept a new contract or reasonable assurance of continued employment status. Under this circumstance, the substitute school employee shall be considered to have voluntarily quit employment.

The claimant is eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. The evidence established was employed on a temporary basis for spot labor jobs. He had to physically go to the employer's office each day and sign up and then wait to see if a job was available. The claimant only received one assignment and it was completed on the same day. The claimant is considered to have voluntarily left for good cause attributable to the employer. Benefits are allowed, if the claimant is otherwise eligible.

## **DECISION:**

The claimant's appeal is deemed. The decision of the representative dated February 26, 2013, reference 02, is reversed. Benefits are allowed, if the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Vicki L. Seeck
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

vls/tll