IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

WILL R HENDERSON

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-13024-JTT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

L A LEASING INC c/o SEDONA GROUP Employer

OC: 10/25/15

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2) – Discharge for Misconduct Iowa Code Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Will Henderson filed an appeal from the November 12, 2015, reference 01, decision that disqualified him for benefits and that relieved the employer's account of liability for benefits, based on an Agency conclusion that Mr. Henderson had been discharged on October 2, 2015 for misconduct in connection with the employment. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on December 15, 2015. Mr. Henderson participated. Chad Baker represented the employer. Department Exhibits D-1 and D-2 were received into evidence.

ISSUE:

Whether the appeal was timely. Whether there is good cause to treat the appeal as timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On November 9, 2015, claimant Will Henderson participated in a fact-finding interview that was held to address his separation from L A Leasing, Inc. /Sedona Staffing. On November 12, 2015, Workforce Development mailed a copy of the November 12, 2015, reference 01, decision to Mr. Henderson's last-known address of record. The decision disqualified Mr. Henderson for benefits and relieved the employer's account of liability for benefits, based on an Agency conclusion that Mr. Henderson had been discharged on October 2, 2015 for misconduct in connection with the employment. The decision contained a warning that an appeal from the decision must be postmarked by November 22, 2015 or received by the Appeals Section by that date. The decision also stated that if the appeal deadline fell on a Saturday, Sunday or legal holiday, the deadline would be extended to the next working day. November 22, 2015 was a Sunday and the next working day was Monday, November 23, 2015. Mr. Henderson received the decision on or about November 13, 2015. On November 25, 2015, Mr. Henderson went to the Davenport Workforce Development Center and completed an appeal form. Mr. Henderson delivered the completed appeal form to the Workforce Development Center staff. The staff member who received the form marked the form received on November 25, 2015. On that same day. The Davenport Workforce Development Center staff faxed the appeal form to the

Appeals Bureau, which received the form on November 25, 2015. Mr. Henderson had taken no steps to appeal the decision prior to November 25, 2015.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. 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. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1. paragraphs "a" through "h". 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten-day deadline for appeal begins to run on the date Workforce Development mails the decision to the parties. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the Agency representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. <u>Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.</u>, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); <u>Johnson v. Board of Adjustment</u>, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (lowa 1976).

An appeal submitted by mail is deemed filed on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it was received, or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion. See 871 AC 24.35(1)(a). See also Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). An appeal submitted by any other means is deemed filed on the date it is received by the Unemployment Insurance Division of Iowa Workforce Development. See 871 IAC 24.35(1)(b).

Mr. Henderson's appeal was filed on November 25, 2015, when he hand delivered the appeal form to the Davenport Workforce Development Center staff.

The evidence in the record establishes that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. Indeed, the appeal was filed two days after the deadline that had been extended to November 23, 2015 by operation of law. The Iowa 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 (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 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 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. When Mr. Henderson received the decision on or about November 13, 2015, he still had more than a week in which to file an appeal by the extended November 23, 2015 appeal deadline. Mr. Henderson elected to wait until two days after that the extended deadline to file his appeal.

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 Workforce Development error or due to misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. See 871 IAC 24.35(2). Because the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6(2), the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to disturb the decision from which Mr. Henderson appealed. See, <u>Beardslee v. IDJS</u>, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and <u>Franklin v. IDJS</u>, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The November 12, 2015, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant's appeal was untimely. The decision that disqualified the claimant for benefits and that relieved the employer's account of liability for benefits, based on the October 2, 2015 discharge, remains in effect.

James E. Timberland Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	

jet/pjs