IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEM PLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

CORTNI K KIRK

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 20A-UI-15770-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

STEPPING STONES CHILD CARE CTR INC

Employer

OC: 03/29/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(26) - Part-Time Worker - Same Wages and Hours

lowa Code § 96.4-3 – Able and Available

lowa Code § 96.7(2)A(2) – Partial Benefits

lowa Code § 96.1(A)(37) - Total and Partial Unemployment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the October 6, 2020, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on January 27, 2021. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Angie Kirk.

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 October 6, 2020. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by October 16, 2020. The appeal was not filed until November 25, 2020, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant stated that she did not receive the notice in this matter until October 18, 2020. Claimant was then asked, if she received the notice on October 18, 2020, why she did not file her appeal until November 25, 2020. Claimant stated that she was waiting to find out the amount of the overpayment before appealing the matters.

Claimant stated she works full time for employer and has done so throughout her filing for unemployment. Although she continued to work full time, she did not report any wages earned

through this job. That is because claimant had intended to file for her two part time jobs. Those hours were reduced or eliminated as a result of the pandemic.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

lowa 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 (lowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules lowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.2(96)(1) and lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (lowa 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 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 (lowa 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 (lowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 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 (lowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. Claimant chose to withhold filing her appeal for an extended period of time while she waited to find out the extent of her overpayment. This is not allowed for in the documentation claimant received.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the lowa 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 lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to lowa Code Section 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).

lowa 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".

lowa Code section 96.19(38) provides:

"Total and partial unemployment".

- a. An individual shall be deemed "totally unemployed" in any week with respect to which no wages are payable to the individual and during which the individual performs no services.
- b. An individual shall be deemed partially unemployed in any week in which either of the following apply:
- (1) While employed at the individual's then regular job, the individual works less than the regular full-time week and in which the individual earns less than the individual's weekly benefit amount plus fifteen dollars.
- (2) The individual, having been separated from the individual's regular job, earns at odd jobs less than the individual's weekly benefit amount plus fifteen dollars.
- c. An individual shall be deemed temporarily unemployed if for a period, verified by the department, not to exceed four consecutive weeks, the individual is unemployed due to a plant shutdown, vacation, inventory, lack of work or emergency from the individual's regular job or trade in which the individual worked full-time and will again work full-time, if the individual's employment, although temporarily suspended, has not been terminated.

Even if claimant was deemed to have filed a timely appeal, claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment benefits. Claimant did continue to work her same hours for her same wages throughout her filing and did not report her earnings. As claimant was working full time hours, under lowa law she is not able and available for work.

DECISION:

The October 6, 2020, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Blair A. Bennett

Administrative Law Judge

<u>February 12, 2021</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn