IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

WAYNE W GREGORY Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-11150-JC-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

OC: 12/20/15 Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Overpayment of Benefits Iowa Code § 96.16(4) – Offenses and Misrepresentation Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-25.1 – Misrepresentation & Fraud

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the April 26, 2016 (reference 06) lowa Workforce Development ("IWD") unemployment insurance decision which concluded the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits because the claimant incorrectly reported, or failed to report, earnings. IWD also imposed a 15% administrative penalty due to misrepresentation.

The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on November 14, 2017. The claimant, Wayne W. Gregory, participated personally. Kendra Mills, investigator, participated on behalf of IWD. IWD Exhibits D-1 through D-7 were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records. 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.

Note to claimant: Additional information about food, housing, and other resources, as referenced in the hearing, can be found by dialing 211 or at www.211iowa.org.

ISSUE:

Is the claimant's appeal timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An initial unemployment insurance decision dated April 26, 2016 (reference 06) resulting in an overpayment of benefits was mailed to the claimant's address of 3751 12th Ave SW, Apartment C-17, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404. This was the claimant's residence and correct mailing address from 2013 until January 2017.

The claimant acknowledged he received the notice of initial decision but overlooked it until November 2016, when he was going through old mail. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by May 6, 2016. The

claimant read the decision, saw that he was overpaid benefits, and shortly thereafter, he called lowa Workforce Development for guidance. He was advised by IWD at that time that he could file an appeal if he disagreed with the decision. The claimant delayed filing the appeal until October 31, 2017, approximately 11 months later (Department Exhibit D-1). The reason the claimant filed his appeal late was because he was dealing with matters in his personal life (including his personal health and housing) and did not get to it sooner.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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 disgualification 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 disgualified 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 disgualified 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 disgualified 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. Board 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 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. 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).

Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. Even if the claimant did not become aware of the initial decision until November 2016, when he went through old mail and saw it, and that is deemed his notice to of the decision, he waited approximately 11 months after having notice of the overpayment to file the appeal. The claimant was instructed by IWD to file an appeal sooner. The administrative law judge is sympathetic to the claimant's personal situation, but based on the evidence presented, concludes that the claimant's failure 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).

DECISION:

The April 26, 2016 (reference 06) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. 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/rvs