IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

JORDAN EVANS

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-18848-AR-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

ENTERPRISE RENT A CAR COMPANY

Employer

OC: 05/17/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal lowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant, Jordan Evans, filed an appeal from the July 22, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon the determination that claimant voluntarily quit employment with the employer, Enterprise Rent-A-Car Company, for personal reasons. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 20, 2021, and was consolidated with the hearing for appeal numbers 21A-Ul-18849-AR-T and 21A-Ul-18850-AR-T. The claimant participated personally. The employer did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. Department's Exhibit D-1 was admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Is the claimant's appeal timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A disqualification decision was mailed to claimant's last known address of record on July 22, 2020. He did receive the decision. He estimated it was received sometime in July 2020. The first sentence of the decision states, "If this decision denies benefits and is not reversed on appeal, it may result in an overpayment which you will be required to repay." The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by August 1, 2020. The appeal was not filed until August 26, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant did not appeal when he received the decision because he agreed with the decision and no longer wished to claim unemployment benefits.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal is untimely.

lowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part: "[u]nless 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."

lowa Admin. Code r. 871—24.35(1) provides:

- 1. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:
- (a) If transmitted via the United States Postal Service on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.
- (b) If transmitted via the State Identification Date Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.
- (c) If transmitted by any means other than [United States Postal Service or the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES)], on the date it is received by the division.

lowa Admin. Code r. 871—24.35(2) provides:

2. The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

The lowa 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 (lowa 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 (lowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 1982).

Here, the claimant received the decision in the mail and, therefore, had an opportunity to file an appeal prior to the appeal deadline. Claimant's delay was not due to an error or misinformation from the Department or due to delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. No other good cause reason has been established for the delay. Claimant's appeal was not filed on time and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to decide the other issue in this matter.

DECISION:

The July 22, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Alexis D. Rowe

Administrative Law Judge

Au DR

October 29, 2021

Decision Dated and Mailed

ar/ol