

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

ALEXIS SHERADEN
Claimant

R C CASINO LLC
Employer

APPEAL 20R-UI-07956-JC-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 03/15/20
Claimant: Appellant (1R)

Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work
Iowa Code § 96.19(38)a & b – Total and Partial Unemployment
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
PL116-136, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant, Alexis Sheraden, filed an appeal from the April 16, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. A first hearing was scheduled between the parties on June 5, 2020. The claimant/appellant failed to appear at the hearing, and the appeal was dismissed. Upon a remand decision from the Employment Appeal Board, the appellant's request to reopen the hearing was granted.

Notice of the second hearing was mailed to the parties' last known addresses of record. A telephone hearing was conducted on August 19, 2020. The claimant participated personally. The employer did not respond to the notice of hearing to furnish a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate in the hearing.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. Department Exhibit D-1 was admitted. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Is the appeal timely?
Is the claimant totally, partially or temporarily unemployed?
Is the employer charged for benefits?
Is the claimant overpaid benefits?
Is the claimant working the same hours and wages for which she was hired?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

An initial unemployment insurance decision (Reference 01) resulting in an allowance of benefits was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on April 16, 2020. The decision

contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by April 26, 2020. Because April 26, 2020 was a Sunday, the final day to appeal was extended to April 27, 2020. At the time of the initial decision, the employer was still paying the claimant even though she was not performing work, so she did not think she needed to appeal the initial decision.

The initial decision also stated: "If you have questions please call customer service at 866-239-0843". The claimant did not contact IWD between April 16, 2020 and April 27, 2020 about whether her current payments would impact her ability to appeal later. Once the claimant discontinued receiving payments from her employer, she reopened her claim for unemployment insurance benefits and filed the appeal. She filed her appeal online on May 19, 2020 (Department Exhibit D-1).

Despite being denied benefits at initial fact-finding, the decision was made by Iowa Workforce Development to release funds of claimants while their claims were pending due to the backlog caused by the recent COVID 19 outbreak. Claimant was one of the individuals whose funds were released pending the initial decision. The administrative record shows, claimant filed for and received a total of \$534.00 in unemployment insurance benefits for the weeks between March 15, 2020 and April 11, 2020.

The claimant also received federal unemployment insurance benefits through Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC). Claimant received \$600.00 in federal benefits for the one-week period ending April 11, 2020.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

Filing – determination – appeal.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.

- b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.
- c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.
- d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins 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 (Iowa 1976).

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 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The credible evidence presented is the claimant received the initial decision within the prescribed period to appeal and did not contact IWD as directed with any questions (such as how a future claim could be impacted if she did not appeal). The claimant accepted the decision at the time because she was receiving other payments from the employer but later changed her mind when the payments stopped.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to follow the clear written instructions to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa 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 Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

Even though claimant is not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits under state law, he/she may be eligible for federally funded unemployment insurance benefits under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act ("Cares Act"), Public Law 116-136. Section 2102 of the CARES Act creates a new temporary federal program called Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) that in general provides up to 39 weeks of unemployment benefits. An individual receiving PUA benefits may also receive the \$600 weekly benefit amount (WBA) under the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) program if he or she is eligible for such compensation for the week claimed.

Claimant must apply for PUA, as noted in the instructions provided in the “Note to Claimant” below.

As claimant has received benefits to which she was not entitled, the next issue in this case is whether the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) provides, in pertinent part:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

Since the decision disqualifying the claimant has been affirmed, the claimant was overpaid \$534.00 in unemployment insurance benefits.

PL116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

(A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus

(B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as “Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation”).

....

(f) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency...

Here, the claimant is disqualified from receiving regular unemployment insurance (UI) benefits. Accordingly, this also disqualifies claimant from receiving Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC). In addition to the regular UI benefits claimant received, he also received an additional \$600.00 in FPUC benefits for the one-week period ending April 11, 2020.

The claimant may have to repay the benefits received thus far, unless the claimant applies and is approved for PUA, as directed in the paragraph below.

DECISION:

The April 16, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

The claimant has been overpaid \$534.00 in regular unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant has also been overpaid \$600.00 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation. The claimant may have to repay the benefits received thus far, unless the claimant applies and is approved for PUA, as directed below.

NOTE TO CLAIMANT:

- This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.
- If you do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations and are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19, you may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). **You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program.** More information about how to apply for PUA is available online at: www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information
 - **If you have applied and have been approved for PUA benefits, this decision will not negatively affect your entitlement to PUA benefits.**



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

August 26, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/sam