IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

ROBERTO MANGUAL ROSARIO

Claimant

APPEAL 22A-UI-07532-LJ-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SEABOARD TRIUMPH FOODS LLC

Employer

OC: 02/27/22

Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal lowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit from Employment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On March 29, 2022, claimant Roberto Mangual Rosario filed an appeal from the March 16, 2022 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based on a determination that he voluntarily quit his employment. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephonic hearing was held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 5, 2022. The claimant, Roberto Mangual Rosario, participated personally. The employer, Seaboard Triumph Foods, L.L.C., did not appear for or participate in the hearing. Spanish/English interpreter Lucia (ID number 10882) of CTS Language Link provided interpretation service for the hearing. No exhibits were admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Did the claimant file a timely appeal?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The disqualification decision was mailed to claimant's last known address of record on March 16, 2022. He did receive the decision immediately after it was sent. Claimant was able to read and understand the decision with the assistance of a translation application on his phone. 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 March 26, 2022. Because March 26 was a Saturday, the deadline was extended until the next business day, March 28, 2022. The appeal was not filed until March 29, 2022, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant did not explain why he waited until after the deadline to file his appeal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant failed to file a timely appeal.

lowa Code § 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."

Iowa 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.

Iowa 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 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. 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).

Here, the claimant received the decision in the mail and, therefore, had an opportunity to file an appeal prior to the appeal deadline. Claimant was able to read and understand the decision, and he successfully called lowa Workforce Development and went to the local office for

assistance. He did not provide any explanation or justifiable barrier for failing to timely file an appeal. 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 (authority) to decide the other issue in this matter.

DECISION:

The March 16, 2022, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Elizabeth A. Johnson

Administrative Law Judge

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

May 10, 2022

Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/lj