

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

CHRISTINE M HOOTEN

Claimant

and

LINCO WATER SVCS WELL PUMP

Employer

HEARING NUMBER: 17BUCFE-00018

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

N O T I C E

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 96.5-2-A

D E C I S I O N

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE

The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Both the Employer and the Claimant submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the parties' additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of either of the party's additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by either party was not presented at hearing. Accordingly all the new and additional information submitted has not been relied upon in making our decision, and has received no weight whatsoever, but rather has been wholly disregarded.

Lastly, the Employment Appeal Board would comment that this Employer is not a base period Employer and therefore its account would not be charged. We would also note that should the Claimant claim for a subsequent benefit year, which would begin in June of 2017, this Employer would also *not* be a base period Employer.

Kim D. Schmett

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

AMG/fnv