

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SUE A BOELK

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 10A-UI-17721-ST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

STEVES ACE HARDWARE

Employer

OC: 11/21/10

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 5-3-a – Job Refusal

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed a department decision dated December 17, 2010, reference 01, that held claimant did not refuse an offer of suitable work on November 29, 2010, and benefits are allowed. A telephone hearing was held on February 9, 2011. The claimant participated. Tamie Imhoff, Office Manager, participated for the employer. Employer Exhibits 1 and 2 was received as evidence.

ISSUE:

Whether the employer filed a timely appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge having heard the testimony of the witnesses, and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The department mailed the decision to the employer's address of record on December 17, 2010. The decision states the appeal deadline date is December 27 (Monday). The employer faxed the appeal to Unemployment Appeals on December 28.

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, subsection 10, 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 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).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

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. 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). 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. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 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 administrative law judge concludes the employer failed to file a timely appeal.

The employer failed to offer any good cause for the one day it delayed the appeal.

DECISION:

The department decision dated December 17, 2010, reference 01, is affirmed. The employer failed to file a timely appeal. The department decision that that claimant did not refuse a suitable offer of work on November 29, 2010, remains in force and affect. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/css