IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

MONTE N BURNS Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-09137-JTT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

OMEGA CABINETS LTD

Employer

OC: 11/23/08 Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.5(7) – Vacation Pay Iowa Code Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Monte Burns filed an appeal from the June 11, 2009, reference 02, decision that denied benefits for the week ending February 21, 2009, based on the Agency's conclusion that Mr. Burns has received vacation pay deductible for that week and that the vacation pay exceeded his weekly benefit amount. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone call on June 13, 2009. Mr. Burns participated. The employer submitted a written statement in lieu of its participation. Exhibit One and Department Exhibits D-1, D-2 and D-3 were received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the Agency's administrative record of benefits disbursed to Mr. Burns.

ISSUE:

Whether there is good cause to deem timely Mr. Burns' late appeal from the June 11, 2009, reference 02 decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On June 11, 2009, Workforce Development mailed a copy of the reference 02, decision to Monte Burns' last-known address of record. The reference 02 decision denied benefits for the week ending February 21, 2009, based on the Agency's conclusion that Mr. Burns has received vacation pay deductible for that week and that the vacation pay exceeded his weekly benefit amount. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by June 21, 2009. The decision also indicated that if the deadline for appeal fell on a Sunday, the deadline would be extended to the next working day. June 21, 2009 was a Sunday and the next working day was Monday, June 22, 2009. Mr. Burns received the reference 02 decision in a timely manner, prior to the deadline or appeal. Mr. Burns drafted an appeal on June 23, 2009 in response to receiving the June 16, 2009 reference 03 overpayment decision. Mr. Burns mailed his appeal in an envelope that bears a June 23, 2009 postmark.

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 disgualification 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 disgualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit 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. <u>Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.</u>, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); <u>Johnson v. Board of Adjustment</u>, 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 <u>Messina v. IDJS</u>, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). See also <u>Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Cedar Rapids v. Employment Appeal Board</u>, 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 appeal in this matter was filed on June 23, 2009, the postmark date. The evidence in the record establishes that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the day the reference 02 decision was mailed to Mr. Burns and the day he filed his appeal.

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. <u>Franklin v. IDJS</u>, 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. <u>Beardslee v. IDJS</u>, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also <u>In re Appeal of Elliott</u>, 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. <u>Hendren v. IESC</u>, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); <u>Smith v. IESC</u>, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the Mr. Burns did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal from the June 11, 2009 reference 02 decision, but delayed his appeal until June 23, 2009 after he received the June 16, 2009, reference 03 overpayment decision.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal from the June 11, 2009, reference 02 decision 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, <u>Beardslee v. IDJS</u>, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and <u>Franklin v. IDJS</u>, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The Agency representative's June 11, 2009, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect. Mr. Burns was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits for the week ending February 21, 2009 due to his receipt of vacation pay that was deductible from that week's benefits and that exceeded that week's benefits.

James E. Timberland Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/pjs