

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

---

**LYLE CRAWFORD**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-24107-B2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 03/22/20**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal  
Iowa Code § 96.3-7 – Recovery of Overpayment of Benefits

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Claimant filed an appeal from the October 15, 2021, reference 05, decision that found claimant to have been overpaid benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on December 27, 2021. The claimant did participate and was represented by attorney Cynthia Hucks.

**ISSUES:**

Whether the appeal is timely?  
Whether claimant is overpaid unemployment insurance benefits?

**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 October 15, 2021. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by October 25, 2021. The appeal was not filed until October 28, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant stated he picked up three different overpayment pieces of mail from IWD at the same time (at or around October 22, 2021 as claimant is often away from home during the week and returns on the weekend). Claimant stated late in the afternoon on October 25, 2021 he called IWD asking about the overpayments and asking if he could file all appeals at the same time. Claimant stated he was told by a representative that he could file all three after talking with an attorney. This would make the overpayment of the LWAP benefits timely and the other two matters untimely.

Claimant was found to be ineligible to receive unemployment benefits in case 21A-UI-03928-DG-T. Claimant did not appeal this decision. Claimant stated he never received the decision denying benefits.

Claimant admitted to receiving state unemployment benefits in this matter in the amount of \$11,037.00.

## 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 have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal in this matter. Although claimant had a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal, he stated he did not on the advice of an IWD representative. (The administrative law judge finds it very hard to believe any IWD representative would tell any claimant not to file an appeal on the day it was due, and instead to wait three days to talk with an attorney and file this appeal late.) Although very hard to believe, the ALJ received no testimony that this was not what occurred.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was potentially due to any 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 is therefore deemed 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 96.3(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.

b. (1) (a) 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 section 96.8, subsection 5. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) 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 section 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.

(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 state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The administrative law judge concludes that claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$11,037.00 for the 22 weeks ending November 7, 2020, pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.3-7 as the disqualification decision that created the overpayment decision has now been affirmed.

**DECISION:**

The October 15, 2021, reference 05, decision is affirmed. Although the appeal in this case was deemed timely, the decision of the representative remains in effect as claimant was overpaid state benefits in the amount of \$11,037.00.



---

Blair A. Bennett  
Administrative Law Judge

January 24, 2022  
Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/mh