

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

JOEY L ANHALT

Claimant,

and

HY-VEE INC

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 09B-UI-16256

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

SECTION: 10A.601 Employment Appeal Board Review

D E C I S I O N

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The notice of hearing in this matter was mailed October 29, 2009. The notice set a hearing for December 4, 2009. The claimant contacted the agency to provide a telephone at which she could be reached for the hearing and received a control number. The claimant had a change of telephone numbers, which she subsequently provided the agency and was provided a new control number. On the day of the hearing, however, the claimant did not appear for or participate in the hearing. The reason the claimant did not appear is because the claimant did not receive the call because the administrative law judge called the old number. The claimant did not know the hearing was taking place.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 10A.601(4) (2009) provides:

4. Appeal board review. The appeal board may on its own motion affirm, modify, or set aside any decision of a administrative law judge on the basis of the evidence previously submitted in such case, or direct the taking of additional evidence, or may permit any of the parties to such decision to initiate further appeals before it. The appeal board shall permit such further appeal by any of the parties interested in a decision of an administrative law judge and by the representative whose decision has been overruled or modified by the administrative law judge. The appeal board shall review the case pursuant to rules adopted by the appeal board. The appeal board shall promptly notify the interested parties of its findings and decision.

Here the claimant did not participate in the hearing through no fault of the claimant. The claimant complied with the notice instructions by providing a telephone number. However, because of a mix-up on the agency's part, the claimant was not contacted, which effectively precluded her participation. For this reason, we find that good cause exists for her nonparticipation. This matter will be remanded for another hearing before an administrative law judge.

DECISION:

The decision of the administrative law judge dated December 7, 2009 is not vacated. This matter is remanded to an administrative law judge in the Workforce Development Center, Appeals Section. The administrative law judge shall conduct a hearing following due notice. After the hearing, the administrative law judge shall issue a decision which provides the parties appeal rights.

John A. Peno

Elizabeth L. Seiser

Monique F. Kuester

AMG/fnv