

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ADAM A RHODES**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 13A-UI-10455-DT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 06/26/11**

**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits  
871 IAC 26.14(7) – Late Call  
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Adam A. Rhodes (claimant) appealed a representative's August 21, 2013 decision (reference 06) that concluded he had been overpaid emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) benefits. A hearing notice was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record for a telephone hearing to be held at 8:30 a.m. on October 8, 2013, in conjunction with one related appeal, 13A-UI-10454-DT. The claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice and provide a telephone number at which he could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing. The record was closed at 8:40 a.m. At 9:00 a.m., the claimant called the Appeals Section and requested that the record be reopened. Based on a review of the information in the administrative file and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUES:**

Should the hearing record be reopened? Was the claimant is overpaid EUC benefits of \$551.39?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The claimant received the hearing notice prior to the October 8, 2013 hearing. The instructions inform the parties that if the party does not contact the Appeals Section and provide the phone number at which the party can be contacted for the hearing, the party will not be called for the hearing. The first time the claimant directly contacted the Appeals Section was on October 8, 2013, 30 minutes after the scheduled start time for the hearing. The claimant had not read all the information on the hearing notice, and had assumed that the Appeals Section would initiate the telephone contact even without a response to the hearing notice.

The representative's decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on August 21, 2013. The claimant received the decision on approximately August 22, 2013. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals

Section by August 31, 2013, a Saturday. The notice also provided that if the appeal date fell on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, the appeal period was extended to the next working day, which in this case was Tuesday, September 3, 2013. The appeal was not filed until it was hand-delivered to a local Agency office on September 13, 2013, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. No explanation was offered to seek to excuse the delay.

A representative issued a decision dated August 19, 2013 (reference 05) that concluded the claimant was disqualified from receiving EUC benefits as of June 23, 2013 because he was monetarily eligible to receive regular unemployment insurance benefits. As determined in the concurrently issued decision in appeal 13A-UI-10454-DT, the claimant did not timely appeal that decision and it has now become final.

The overpayment decision was issued in this case as a result of the August 19, 2013 (reference 05) disqualification decision.

The claimant has received EUC benefits after June 23, 2013 in the amount of \$551.39.

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

The first issue in this case is whether the claimant's request to reopen the hearing should be granted or denied. After a hearing record has been closed the administrative law judge may not take evidence from a non-participating party but can only reopen the record and issue a new notice of hearing if the non-participating party has demonstrated good cause for the party's failure to participate. 871 IAC 26.14(7)b. The record shall not be reopened if the administrative law judge does not find good cause for the party's late contact. *Id.* Failing to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing are not good cause for reopening the record. 871 IAC 26.14(7)c.

The first time the claimant called the Appeals Section for the October 8, 2013 hearing was after the hearing had been closed. Although the claimant intended to participate in the hearing, the claimant failed to read or follow the hearing notice instructions and did not contact the Appeals Section prior to the hearing. The rule specifically states that failure to read or follow the instructions on the hearing notice does not constitute good cause to reopen the hearing. The claimant did not establish good cause to reopen the hearing. Therefore, the claimant's request to reopen the hearing is denied.

If a party fails to make a timely appeal of a representative's decision and there is no legal excuse under which the appeal can be deemed to have been made timely, the decision as to the merits has become final and is not subject to further review. Iowa Code § 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. *Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Board of Adjustment*, 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 Iowa 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 then 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).

A party does not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal if the delay is due to Agency error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service. 871 IAC 24.35(2). Failing to read and follow the instructions for filing an appeal is not a reason outside the appellant's control that deprived the appellant from having a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the prescribed time was not due to a legally excusable reason so that it can be treated as timely. The administrative law judge further concludes that because the appeal was not timely, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal, regardless of whether the merits of the appeal would be valid. See, *Beardslee*, supra; *Franklin*, supra; and *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company v. Employment Appeal Board*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

As determined in the concurrently issued decision in appeal 13A-UI-10454-DT, the claimant did not timely appeal the decision that caused the overpayment in this case. If the claimant had a dispute with whether or not he should have been disqualified as a result of being monetarily eligible for a regular claim for unemployment insurance benefits, then he needed to have filed an appeal from that decision within the appeal period for that decision. Iowa Code § 96.6-2; *Beardslee v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979). The decision causing the disqualification has now become final and is not subject to review in this case.

The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. Iowa Code § 96.3-7. In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was ineligible for those benefits.

The administrative law judge concludes that the claimant is overpaid benefits of \$551.39 pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.3-7 due to the disqualification decision issued on August 19, 2013. Even though those benefits were received in good faith, the overpaid benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

**DECISION:**

The representative's August 21, 2013 decision (reference 06) is affirmed. The claimant is overpaid benefits of \$551.39.

---

Lynette A. F. Donner  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/css