IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

ROXANAS MENDEZ

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-11185-SWT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC

Employer

OC: 08/12/12

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 August 12, 2012, reference 01, that concluded she was discharged for work-connected misconduct. A telephone hearing was held on scheduled for October 9, 2012. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. Neither party participated in the hearing. Based on the administrative file and the law, the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision are entered.

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 August 31, 2012. The decision concluded and stated the decision was final unless a written appeal was postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by September 10, 2012.

The claimant received the decision within the ten-day period for appealing the decision. She filed a written appeal on September 17, 2012, which is after the time period for appealing had expired. The reason she delayed in filing her appeal is unknown.

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. lowa 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); <u>Beardslee v. IDJS</u>, 276 N.W.2d 373 (lowa 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. <u>Hendren v. IESC</u>, 217 N.W.2d 255 (lowa 1974); <u>Smith v. IESC</u>, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). There is no evidence that the claimant did not have 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 August 12, 2012, reference 01, is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the unemployment insurance decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits remains in effect.

Steven A. Wise	
Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
saw/kjw	