## BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

KATHRYN J CREES	HEARING NUMBER: 18BUI-08828
Claimant	
and	EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
ADVANCE SERVICES INC	
Employer	· · ·

## NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a request for a REHEARING is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within 20 days of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION:** 96.5-1J, 96.3-7

## DECISION

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The issue of timeliness was raised when the Claimant filed an appeal postmarked December 1, 2017, nearly two months beyond the statutory deadline of October 13, 2017. The reason for the delay was because the Claimant had attempted to access the website on October 4<sup>th</sup>, but was told the site was down. When she finally effectuated her appeal, a hearing was set up for November 15<sup>th</sup> in which she was told she appealed the wrong decision. Due to the confusion, we shall find the Claimant's appeal timely.

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

The Claimant submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information

submitted by the Claimant was not presented at hearing. Accordingly all the new and additional information submitted has not been relied upon in making our decision, and has received no weight whatsoever, but rather has been wholly disregarded.

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

AMG/fnv