

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

MICHAEL DINGMAN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 20A-DUA-00612-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT**

OC: 08/23/20
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal
Public Law 116-136, Section 2102 – Pandemic Unemployment Assistance

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Michael Dingman filed a late appeal from the September 22, 2020 Assessment for PUA Benefits that denied Pandemic Unemployment Assistance Benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that Mr. Dingman did not meet the eligibility requirements. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on November 19, 2020. Mr. Dingman participated and presented additional testimony through Lyle Dingman. The administrative law judge took official notice of the September 22, 2020 Assessment for PUA Benefits and received Exhibit A 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 September 22, 2020, Iowa Workforce Development mailed the September 22, 2020 Assessment for PUA Benefits decision to Michael Dingman to his last-known address. On Friday, September 25, 2020, Mr. Dingman collected the correspondence from his mailbox. Mr. Dingman waited until Monday, September 28, 2020 to review the decision. When he did that, he notified the denial of benefits and the deadline for appeal. The decision stated that it would become final unless an appeal was postmarked by October 3, 2020 or was received by the Appeal Section by that date. The decision also stated that if the deadline fell on a Saturday, Sunday or legal holiday, the deadline would be extended to the next working day. October 3, 2020 was a Saturday and the next working day was Monday, October 5, 2020. On October 6, 2020, Mr. Dingman filed an online appeal via the Iowa Workforce Development website. The Appeals Bureau received the appeal on October 6, 2020.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 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, subsections 10 and 11, 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. *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).

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 Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.35(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 Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.35(1)(b).

The evidence in the record establishes 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. 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). One 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 evidence in the record establishes an untimely appeal. Mr. Dingman received the decision in a timely manner and had a reasonable opportunity to file an appeal by the extended October 5, 2020 deadline. Mr. Dingman elected to delay filing the appeal until one day after the extended appeal deadline. The late filing of the appeal was not attributable to Iowa Workforce Development or to the United States Postal Service. Accordingly, there is not good cause to treat the late appeal as a timely appeal. See Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.35(2). Because the appeal was untimely, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to disturb the September 22, 2020 Assessment for PUA Benefits that denied Pandemic Unemployment Assistance Benefits. See *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The claimant's appeal was untimely. The September 22, 2020 Assessment for PUA Benefits that denied Pandemic Unemployment Assistance Benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant did not meet the eligibility requirements, remains in effect.



James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

December 3, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/mh