

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

NUGUSSI S LIGA
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-04134-H2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

OC: 02/24/13
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated March 29, 2013, reference 01, that denied benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for June 27, 2013. The appellant did not participate in the hearing. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the representative's decision should be affirmed.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to be available at the telephone number he provided he could be reached at for the hearing. The administrative law judge had difficulty reaching the interpreter but was finally able to do so. When the administrative law judge attempted to call the claimant at the telephone number he provided, she received a message indicating that the telephone number was not accepting phone calls. The administrative law judge attempted to reach the claimant at the telephone number on the DBRO screen but that number did not work either. After waiting until 4:20 p.m., twenty minutes after the start time of the hearing, the administrative law judge closed the record.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated March 29, 2013, reference 01, is affirmed. The representative's decision remains in effect. Benefits are denied.

Teresa K. Hillary
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/pjs