

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

---

**CHARLOTTE A ROBINSON**

Claimant

and

**HAYES ENTERPRISE 129 CORP**

Employer

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**HEARING NUMBER: 16B-UI-07795**

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
DECISION**

**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:** 96.5-1, 96.4-3

**DECISION**

**UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED**

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board, one member dissenting, 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 Employer has requested this matter be remanded for a new hearing. The majority Board members find the applicant did not provide good cause to remand this matter. Therefore, the remand request is **DENIED**.

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

---

James M. Strohman

**DISSENTING OPINION OF KIM D. SCHMETT:**

I respectfully dissent from the majority decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the administrative law judge's decision. I would remand this decision for a determination of whether Hayes Enterprises 129 Corp. is an employer in this instance or if its position has been assumed by NEMUR, LLC.

Iowa Code section 96.7(6)“b” “1” provides in relevant part:

If an organization, trade, or business, or a clearly segregable and identifiable part of an organization, trade, or business, for which contributions have been paid is sold or transferred to a subsequent employing unit, or if one or more employing units have been reorganized or merged into a single employing unit, and the successor employer, having qualified as an employer as defined in section 96.19, subsection 16, paragraph “b”, continues to operate the organization, trade, or business, the successor employer shall assume the position of the predecessor employer or employers with respect to the predecessors’ payrolls, contributions, accounts, and contribution rates to the same extent as if no change had taken place in the ownership or control of the organization, trade, or business...

I would further note that if Hayes Enterprises 129 Corp. has received a Statement of Charges for the second quarter of 2016 that contains charges related to their employee’s claim, Hayes should promptly appeal that decision according to the instructions contained in the Statement of Charges.

---

Kim D. Schmett

Lastly, the Employment Appeal Board would note that the Employer 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 Employer 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