

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

NADINE I KIBIBI
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-11974-B2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

**OC: 01/31/21
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(26) – Part-Time Worker – Same Wages and Hours
Iowa Code § 96.4-3 – Able and Available
Iowa Code § 96.7(2)A(2) – Partial Benefits
Iowa Code § 96.1(A)(37) – Total and Partial Unemployment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the March 25, 2021, reference 03, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on July 19, 2021. The claimant did participate. Employer failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. Interpretive services were provided for the hearing.

ISSUES:

Whether the appeal is timely?
Whether claimant is still employed at the same hours and wages?
Whether claimant is eligible to receive partial benefits?
Whether claimant is able and available for work?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on March 25, 2021. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by April 4, 2021. The appeal was not filed until April 30, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant stated she had not received the decision and only filed the appeal after she found out through contacting IWD that she was not eligible for benefits.

Claimant worked as a meat skinner for employer. This required her to lift and move heavy pieces of meat. On January 19, 2021 claimant slipped outside of her residence and broke her arm. Claimant was unable to return to her job after breaking her arm.

Swift called claimant after her injury and asked when she might be able to return to work. Claimant indicated that she was going to quit her job as employer did not have any jobs that she could do with her damaged arm.

In April 2020 claimant received a note from her doctor indicating that she not move anything larger than 10 lbs. Claimant indicated that the carcasses she worked with were much larger than 10 pounds. Claimant also indicated that she would not be able to operate any of the knives as she was not comfortable with her extremely weak arm.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

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. . . . 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.

The ten calendar days for appeal begin running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, 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).

Pursuant to rules Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.2(96)(1) and Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

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 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. *Franklin v. IDJS*, 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. IDJS*, 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 record shows that the appellant did not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was due to an Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was therefore timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code Section 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge retains jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See, *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

Iowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(1)a provides:

Benefits eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

(1) Able to work. An individual must be physically and mentally able to work in some gainful employment, not necessarily in the individual's customary occupation, but which is engaged in by others as a means of livelihood.

a. Illness, injury or pregnancy. Each case is decided upon an individual basis, recognizing that various work opportunities present different physical requirements. A statement from a medical practitioner is considered prima facie evidence of the physical ability of the individual to perform the work required. A pregnant individual must meet the same criteria for determining ableness as do all other individuals.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(35) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(35) Where the claimant is not able to work and is under the care of a medical practitioner and has not been released as being able to work.

Inasmuch as the injury was not work-related and the treating physician has not released the claimant to return to work without restrictions, the claimant has not established the ability to work. Benefits are withheld until such time as the claimant obtains a full medical release to return to work.

The Supreme Court ruled that a claimant with a non-work related injury was not able to and available for work and that section 96.5(1)d was not applicable when she returned to work with a restricted release, could not perform her prior job and could not establish any other type of work of which she was capable. *Geiken v. Luthern Home for the Aged*, 468 N.W.2d 223 (Iowa 1991). As the claimant did not establish any other job she might be able to do, she is still not able and available to work.

DECISION:

The March 25, 2021, reference 03, decision is affirmed. Although the appeal in this case was deemed timely, the decision of the representative remains in effect as claimant has not shown she is able and available to work.



Blair A. Bennett
Administrative Law Judge

July 27, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/mh