

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**THOMAS L SMITH**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-06330-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**JACOBSON STAFFING**  
Employer

**OC: 03/07/10**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code section 96.5(3)(a) – Work Refusal  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer appealed from an unemployment insurance decision dated April 16, 2010, reference 01, that allowed benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for June 15, 2010. The employer/appellant provided a telephone number for the hearing, but was not available at that number at the scheduled time of the hearing. Claimant Thomas Smith was available for the hearing. Based on the employer/appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

**ISSUE:**

Decision on the record.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant, Jacobson Staffing, responded to the hearing notice instructions and provided a telephone number at which a representative could be reached for the hearing: Bert Shinbori at 309-797-8340. At the scheduled time of the hearing, the administrative law judge made two attempts to contact the employer representative for the hearing. On each attempt, the administrative law judge made contact with the employer, was placed on hold, and then the call was terminated by the employer. After the call was terminated by the employer a second time, the administrative law judge advised the claimant he would leave the record open until 15 minutes after the 1:00 p.m. scheduled start of the hearing to give the employer/appellant an opportunity to contact the Appeals Section and make itself available for the hearing. The employer did not make further contact with the Appeals Section. At 1:19 p.m., the record was closed and the claimant was dismissed from the call. The employer/appellant did not request 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 and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

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 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 appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's April 16, 2010, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The decision allowing benefits 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.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/pjs