# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

**SHANNA E FLORES** 

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-08911-DWT** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

**DECISION** 

**DOLLAR GENERAL** 

Employer

OC: 05/10/09

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge 871 IAC 26.8(5) - Decision on the Record

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Dollar General (employer) appealed a representative's June 12, 2009 decision (reference 01) that concluded Shanna E. Flores (claimant) was qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits, and held the employer's account subject to charge because the claimant had been discharged for nondisqualifying reasons. A telephone hearing was held on July 8, 2009. The claimant participated in the hearing. Even though the employer's representative, TALX, faxed in several documents the morning of the hearing, no one responded to the hearing notice by providing the name of a witness or the phone number to call any witness. No one appeared on the employer's behalf. Based on the administrative file and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

## FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The employer failed to provide a telephone number at which any witness could be reached for the hearing. No one on the employer's behalf participated in the hearing or requested a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the 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.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record. This includes the faxed documents a TALX representative faxed in the morning of the hearing. Based on all the information in the administrative record, the administrative law judge concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

Pursuant to the rule and Iowa Code § 17A.12-3, the employer must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of this 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 employer from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

### **DECISION:**

The representative's June 12, 2009 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The decision holding the claimant qualified to receive benefits as of May 10, 2009, 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.

Debra L. Wise Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	
dlw/css	