IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

CURTIS A ANDERSON Claimant

APPEAL NO. 20A-UI-15579-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC

Employer

OC: 04/19/20 Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal lowa Admin. Code ch. 871 r. 24.23(10) – Leave of Absence lowa Code § 96.4-3 – Able and Available

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the June 16, 2020, reference 03, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on January 26, 2021. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Lori Direnzo.

ISSUES:

Whether the appeal is timely?

Whether claimant is able and available for work?

Whether claimant is on an approved leave of absence?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on June 16, 2020. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by June 26, 2020. The appeal was not filed until November 9, 2020, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant stated that he never received the decision that found him ineligible to receive benefits. He further stated that he'd stopped applying for benefits as he was receiving short term disability.

Claimant stated that he was sick early on in the Covid period and filed for benefits for three weeks while only working a small portion of the time. Claimant stated that he then worked part time and reported income for the next three weeks. Claimant then reported no income for the next couple of weeks as he did not include the benefits he'd received. He stopped filing when he said he was approved for permanent disability.

Employer's statement as to the hours worked differed with claimant's hours. Employer stated that employer's business was shut down from April 22 through May 6, 2020. For the period

from May 7 through June 6, 2020 they were in full production. Employer stated claimant was paid for working large parts of these weeks, and was paid bonuses. Employer did state that claimant was on a temporary disability.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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.

The ten calendar days for appeal begin 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 (lowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules lowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.2(96)(1) and lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (lowa 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 lowa 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 (lowa 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 (lowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 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 (lowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal as he stated he never received the decision denying benefits, and would not have known of the decision disgualifying him as he'd stopped applying for benefits.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the lowa Employment Security Law was possibly due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal is therefore deemed to have been timely filed pursuant to lowa Code Section 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge retains jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See, *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (lowa 1979) and *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (lowa 1979).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(10) provides:

Availability disqualifications. The following are reasons for a claimant being disqualified for being unavailable for work.

(10) The claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence, such period is deemed to be a period of voluntary unemployment and shall be considered ineligible for benefits for such period.

lowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.22(1)a provides:

Benefits eligibility conditions. For an individual to be eligible to receive benefits the department must find that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work. The individual bears the burden of establishing that the individual is able to work, available for work, and earnestly and actively seeking work.

(1) Able to work. An individual must be physically and mentally able to work in some gainful employment, not necessarily in the individual's customary occupation, but which is engaged in by others as a means of livelihood.

a. Illness, injury or pregnancy. Each case is decided upon an individual basis, recognizing that various work opportunities present different physical requirements. A statement from a medical practitioner is considered prima facie evidence of the physical ability of the individual to perform the work required. A pregnant individual must meet the same criteria for determining ableness as do all other individuals.

As the claimant stated he was off from work the first three weeks because of illness, and was only able to make it into work for a few days, claimant is not able and available for work the days he did not arrive, and is not eligible for benefits. After the three weeks when claimant was off for illness, he was not able to make it in to full time work and is not eligible for benefits for the days he didn't feel healthy enough for work. Additionally, claimant is not eligible for benefits for any week in which he is receiving disability benefits. As these events encompass the entire time claimant was off from work, claimant is not entitled to receive unemployment benefits in this matter as, at all times of his filings he was not able and available for work.

DECISION:

The June 16, 2020, reference 03, decision is affirmed. Although the appeal in this case is deemed timely, the claimant was not able and available for work for the days and weeks he filed for unemployment benefits and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

125 h

Blair A. Bennett Administrative Law Judge

February 10, 2021 Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn