

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

JON K ALEXANDRES
Claimant

APPEAL 15A-UI-03779-N-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

PERMEATE REFINING LLC
Employer

OC: 10/12/14
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.3-5 – Eligibility for Monetary Recalculation
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

John K. Alexandres filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated March 9, 2015, reference 01, which denied the claimant's request to have his unemployment insurance claim redetermined as a business closing effective October 12, 2014. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on April 29, 2015. The hearing scheduled for 11:00 a.m. that day began at 11:45 a.m., due to a late call by the claimant. Although duly notified, the employer did not participate.

ISSUE:

At issue in this matter is whether the appeal filed was timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on March 9, 2015. The claimant received the decision. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by March 19, 2015. The appeal was not filed until March 26, 2015, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision.

During this time, Mr. Alexandres was away from his residence in Apollo Beach, Florida, and visiting the state of Iowa due to the recent death of his mother. Mr. Alexandres returned to his Apollo Beach, Florida, address intermittently. During a visit to his residence the claimant discovered the envelope containing the adjudicator's decision, but Mr. Alexandres failed to open the letter for an approximate one-week period. When the claimant filed his appeal, it was beyond the ten-day statutory limit. Mr. Alexandres filed an appeal in this matter, in part, for the purpose of going on a record to emphasize that he had no fraudulent intent when he requested that his claim be redetermined as a business closing.

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 § 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to § 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 § 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to § 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving § 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 § 96.8, subsection 5.

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 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 of Iowa has declared there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representative's 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 Department of Job Service, 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 Department of Job Service, 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 administrative law judge concludes that the failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was not due to Agency error or action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to 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.

DECISION:

The representative's decision dated March 9, 2015, reference 01, is hereby affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Terence P. Nice
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

css/css