

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LYNAE HEINS
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 13A-UI-00156-ET

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

REMEDY INTELLIGENT STAFFING INC
Employer

**OC: 12-25-11
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.4-3 – Able and Available for Work
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the December 13, 2012, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was scheduled by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on February 21, 2013. The appellant provided a phone number prior to the hearing but was not available at that number when called twice for the hearing and did not have an answering machine. The claimant did call at 1:20 p.m. and stated she heard the phone calls the administrative law judge made to her at or about 1:00 p.m. but thought it was a telemarketer because the number came up as a private number and consequently she did not answer, participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the available evidence in the administrative file and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the representative's decision should be affirmed.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having considered all of the available evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant provided a phone number prior to the hearing but was not available at that number when called twice for the hearing and did not have an answering machine. The claimant did call at 1:20 p.m. and stated she heard the phone calls the administrative law judge made to her at or about 1:00 p.m. but thought it was a telemarketer because the number came up as a private number and consequently she did not answer, 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 administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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.

Pursuant to the rule, the appellant must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause that prevented the appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated December 13, 2012, reference 02, is affirmed. The representative's decision denying benefits to the claimant remains in effect. This decision will become final unless a written request establishing good cause to reopen the record is made to the administrative law judge within 15 days of the date of this decision.

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/pjs