

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**MARY EGGIMAN**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-04507-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**SYSTEMS UNLIMITED INC**  
Employer

**OC: 03/09/08 R: 03  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge  
Iowa Code Section 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Mary Eggiman filed an appeal from the April 4, 2008, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on May 27, 2008. Ms. Eggiman participated. Kerry Wilken, Human Resources Specialist represented the employer. Tammy Reynolds, Resource Coordinator, was also present on behalf of the employer. Exhibits D-1 and D-2 were received into the record.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant's appeal was timely.

Whether there is good cause to deem the claimant's appeal timely.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The April 4, 2008, reference 01, decision was mailed to Mary Eggiman's last-known address of record on April 4, 2008. Ms. Eggiman received the decision on or before April 8, 2008. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by April 14, 2008. The decision provided that address to which the appeal could be mailed: The decision provided the telephone number to which the appeal could be faxed: 515-242-5144. The decision provided a telephone number for Ms. Eggiman to call if she had any questions about the decision or about filing an appeal. On April 8, Ms. Eggiman drafted an appeal. Ms. Eggiman then faxed her appeal to a number other than the number designated in the April 4, 2008, reference 01 decision. The greater weight of the evidence indicates that the appeal faxed on April 8 was never received at Workforce Development. Ms. Eggiman waited a month to follow up on the appeal she had faxed on April 8. Ms. Eggiman contacted a Workforce Development representative by calling a number other than the number designated on the April 4, 2008, reference 01 decision. Ms. Eggiman does not know what number she dialed to reach a Workforce Development representative. Ms. Eggiman learned that she had faxed her appeal to the wrong number. On May 9, Ms. Eggiman faxed an appeal to the Appeals Section. Ms. Eggiman's faxed appeal was received by the Appeals Section on May 9.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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 disqualification 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 disqualified 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 disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, 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 disqualified 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-day deadline for appeal begins to run on the date Workforce Development mails the decision to the parties. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the Agency 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).

An appeal submitted by mail is deemed filed 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 was 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. See 871 AC 24.35(1)(a). See also Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). See also Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Cedar Rapids v. Employment Appeal Board, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990). An appeal submitted by any other means is deemed filed on the date it is received by the Unemployment Insurance Division of Iowa Workforce Development. See 871 IAC 24.35(1)(b).

The evidence in the record establishes that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date of the April 4, 2008, reference 01 decision 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. 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 thus 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). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The evidence indicates that Ms. Eggiman disregarded the clearly stated appeal instructions that appeared on the April 4, 2008, reference 01 decision. The evidence indicates that the appeal Ms. Eggiman drafted and faxed to a wrong number on April 8, did not arrive at Workforce Development. The evidence indicates that Ms. Eggiman's appeal was not received at Workforce Development until May 9, 2008, when Ms. Eggiman faxed it to the Appeals Section. The appeal was filed on May 9, the day the Agency actually received the appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that 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. See 871 IAC 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code section 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. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's April 4, 2008, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/pjs