# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEM PLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

**GARY L DUBBE** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-18665-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE

Employer

OC: 05/10/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal lowa Code § 96.4-3 – Able and Available

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the August 19, 2020, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 8, 2021. The claimant did participate and had witness Linda Dubbe. Employer failed to respond to the hearing notice and did not participate.

### **ISSUES:**

Whether the appeal is timely? Whether claimant is able and available for work?

#### 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 August 19, 2020. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by August 29, 2020. The appeal was not filed until August 20, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant admitted to receiving the decision denying benefits. Claimant and his wife could not adequately explain why they'd not filed a timely appeal.

Claimant stated that he felt bad on March 14, 2021. Employer told claimant to stay home out of Covid concern. Two days later claimant suffered a heart attack. His doctor told him that he didn't want claimant returning to work until after his open heart surgery in August.

#### **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 Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.2(96)(1) and Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(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 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 have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the lowa Employment Security Law was not 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 was not timely filed pursuant to lowa Code Section 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge lacks 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).

## **DECISION:**

The August 19, 2020, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Blair A. Bennett

Administrative Law Judge

October 13, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/mh