

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ADRINA A MARTINEZ**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 10A-UI-07358-DT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**APAC CUSTOMER SERVICES INC**  
Employer

**OC: 04/18/10**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Leaving  
§ 17A.12-3 – Non-appearance of Party  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

An appeal was filed from a representative's unemployment insurance decision dated May 12, 2010 (reference 01) that concluded Adrina A. Martinez (claimant/appellant) was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from APAC Customer Services, Inc. (employer/respondent). A telephone hearing was initially scheduled for July 9, 2010. The claimant received the hearing notice and responded by calling the Appeals Section on June 14, 2010. She indicated that she would participate in the hearing at a specified telephone number, but she requested that the hearing be rescheduled, which it was for July 19, 2010 at 12:00 p.m. However, when the administrative law judge called the claimant's number at the scheduled time for the hearing, the claimant was not available. Therefore, she did not participate in the hearing. The employer responded to the hearing notice and indicated that Turkessa Newsone would participate as the employer's representative. When the administrative law judge contacted the employer for the hearing, Ms. Newsone agreed that the administrative law judge should make a determination based upon a review of the available information. The administrative law judge considered the record closed at 12:10 p.m. At 2:12 p.m., the claimant called the Appeals Section and requested that the record be reopened for her participation. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the available information, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

**ISSUE:**

Should the representative's decision be affirmed on a basis of a review of the available information?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to be available at the scheduled day and time set for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. The

administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the available information to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The Iowa Administrative Procedures Act Chapter 17A.12-3 provides in pertinent part:

If a party fails to appear or participate in a contested case proceeding after proper service of notice, the presiding officer may, if no adjournment is granted, enter a default decision or proceed with the hearing and make a decision in the absence of the party. ... If a decision is rendered against a party who failed to appear for the hearing and the presiding officer is timely requested by that party to vacate the decision for good cause, the time for initiating a further appeal is stayed pending a determination by the presiding officer to grant or deny the request. If adequate reasons are provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall vacate the decision and, after proper service of notice, conduct another evidentiary hearing. If adequate reasons are not provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall deny the motion to vacate.

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

871 IAC 26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals section with the names and telephone numbers of its witnesses by the scheduled time of the hearing, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

At issue is a request to reopen the record made after the hearing had concluded. The request to reopen the record is denied because the party making the request failed to participate by reading and following the instructions on the hearing notice.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed the available information and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed. 871 IAC 26.8(5).

**DECISION:**

The representative's unemployment insurance decision dated May 12, 2010 (reference 01) is affirmed. The decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits remains in effect.

---

Lynette A. F. Donner  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/pjs