IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

	68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - El
CHRIS M SWANSON Claimant	APPEAL NO: 14A-UI-05444-S2
	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION
CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY Employer	
	OC: 02/16/14 Claimant: Appellant (2)

Section 96.3-7 - Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed a representative's decision dated May 16, 2014, reference 02, that concluded the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits. After a hearing notice was mailed to the claimant's last-known addresses of record, a hearing was held on June 16, 2014, in Des Moines, Iowa. The claimant participated personally. The employer indicated it would not appear for the hearing.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witness and having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The overpayment issue was created by 14A-UI-03128-BT. Judge Ackerman determined in her decision that the waiver provisions of the law did not apply and the employer's account would not be charged. For the claimant to appeal the provisions of that decision, he must appeal that decision to the Employment Appeal Board. The representative's decision dated May 16, 2014, reference 02, is a reiteration of the amount that was determined in Judge Ackerman's decision.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the following reasons the administrative law judge concludes the claimant overpayment of unemployment insurance benefits has previously been adjudicated.

lowa Code section 96.3(7)a-b, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault,

the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding § 96.8, subsection 5.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding § 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to § 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this states pursuant to § 602.10101.

The administrative law judge concluded in 14A-UI-03128-BT that the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits and the waiver provisions of the law did not apply. The employer's account would not be charged. This administrative law judge cannot address the same issues that were adjudicated by another administrative law judge. The matter is voided and held moot.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated May 16, 2014, reference 02, is reversed. This administrative law judge cannot address the same issues that were adjudicated by another administrative law judge. The matter is voided and held moot.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css