

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**RICHARD T WILLIAMS**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 15A-UI-05240-LDT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**APAC CUSTOMER SERVICES INC**

Employer

**OC: 08/04/13**

**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Richard T. Williams (claimant) appealed a representative's September 17, 2013 decision (reference 01) that concluded he was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from APAC Customer Services, Inc. (employer). After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on June 8, 2015. The claimant participated in the hearing. Turkessa Newsone appeared on the employer's behalf. During the hearing, Exhibit A-1 was entered into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

Was the claimant's appeal timely or are there legal grounds under which it can be treated as timely?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The representative's decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on September 17, 2013. The claimant received the decision within a few days thereafter. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by September 27, 2013. The appeal was not filed until it was postmarked on April 30, 2015.

The claimant did not appeal by the deadline in September 2013 because he was consumed in seeking new employment, and thereafter was consumed by working in his new job. He also misplaced the representative's decision in his papers. He did not think of the disqualification again until February when he received another representative's decision issued February 9, 2015 (reference 03) advising him that his income tax refund was being withheld as an offset against the overpayment of unemployment insurance benefits which had occurred as a result of the issuance of the disqualification decision on September 17, 2013. Even so, he further waited to submit his appeal until April 30, 2015.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

If a party fails to make a timely appeal of a representative's decision and there is no legal excuse under which the appeal can be deemed to have been made timely, the decision as to the merits has become final and is not subject to further review. Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides that unless the affected party (here, the claimant) files an appeal from the decision within ten calendar days, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied as set out by the decision.

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). Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 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 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 then 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).

A party does not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal if the delay is due to Agency error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service. Rule 871 IAC 24.35(2). Failing to read and follow the instructions for filing an appeal is not a reason outside the appellant's control that deprived the appellant from having a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. Delaying because of performing a work search or undertaking new employment are not reasons that would deprive an appellant from having a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. 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 prescribed time was not due to a legally excusable reason so that it can be treated as timely. The administrative law judge further concludes that because the appeal was not timely, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal, regardless of whether the merits of the appeal would be valid. See, *Beardslee*, supra; *Franklin*, supra; and *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company v. Employment Appeal Board*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

**DECISION:**

The representative's September 17, 2013 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative has become final and remains in full force and effect. Benefits are denied.

---

Lynette A. F. Donner  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/mak