

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

RYAN D BAKER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-02115-SWT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HY-VEE INC
Employer

OC: 12/30/12
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated February 1, 2013, reference 03, that concluded he was discharged for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was scheduled for March 19, 2013. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. The claimant did not provide a telephone number to call for the hearing and failed to participate in the hearing. Julia Day participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer and agreed that a decision could be made based on the information in the file.

ISSUE:

Was the appeal in this case filed timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

An unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on February 1, 2013. The decision concluded he had been discharged for work-connected misconduct and stated the decision was final unless a written appeal was postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by February 11, 2013.

The claimant received the decision within the ten-day period for appealing the decision. He filed a written appeal on February 19, 2013, which is after the time period for appealing had expired. The reason the claimant delayed in filing his appeal is not known.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the claimant filed a timely appeal.

The law states that an unemployment insurance decision is final unless a party appeals the decision within ten days after the decision was mailed to the party's last known address. Iowa Code § 96.6-2.

The Iowa Supreme Court has ruled that appeals from unemployment insurance decisions must be filed within the time limit set by statute and the administrative law judge has no authority to review a decision if a timely appeal is not filed. Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979); Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979). In this case, the claimant's appeal was filed after the deadline for appealing expired.

The next question is whether the claimant had a reasonable opportunity to file 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). There is no evidence that claimant lacked a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The failure to file a timely appeal was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service, which under 871 IAC 24.35(2) would excuse the delay in filing an appeal. Since the appeal was not filed timely, there is no jurisdiction to make a decision on the merits of the appeal.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 1, 2013, reference 03, is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the unemployment insurance decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits remains in effect. The disqualification based on the separation from Hy-Vee Inc. can be lifted if the claimant presents proof that he has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount since April 29, 2012.

Steven A. Wise
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

saw/pjs