IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

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

LARISSA L DESVIGNES

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 17A-UI-13350-S1-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

FLAGGER PROS USA LLC

Employer

OC: 03/26/17

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit Section 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Larissa Desvignes (claimant) appealed a representative's December 11, 2017, decision (reference 02) that concluded she was not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because she voluntarily quit work with Flagger Pros USA (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was scheduled for January 19, 2018. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated by Victoria Johnson, Human Resources Manager. Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal was filed in a timely manner.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was residing in Davenport, Iowa, until the last week in November 2017, when she moved to St. Louis, Missouri. She did not notify Iowa Workforce Development that she changed her address. The claimant never notified the United States Postal Service that she changed her address. A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on December 11, 2017. Her roommate in Davenport, Iowa, contacted her and told her she had mail from Iowa Workforce Development. The claimant told the roommate to forward the mail to her. She did not ask her to open the letter. She did not receive the decision. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by December 21, 2017. On December 20, 2017, the claimant went on line and changed her address with Iowa Workforce Development. The claimant's appeal was not filed until December 27, 2017, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision.

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 disqualification 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 disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsections 10 and 11, 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 calendar days for appeal begins 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).

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 lowa 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 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 not due to any Agency error or

misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to 871 IAC 24.35(2). The claimant did not file a timely appeal because she chose not to tell the United States Postal Service or the Agency of her move. A party cannot tell an Agency to deliver mail to one address and then bear no responsibility for failure to receive the mail at a different address. The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to lowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (lowa 1979) and *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (lowa 1979).

DECISION:

The December 11, 2017, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits.

Beth A. Scheetz Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/rvs