# IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

**ANGELA G TERRELL** 

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 20A-UI-11716-JTT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

**DECISION** 

**ARETE TECHNOLOGIES INC** 

Employer

OC: 06/28/20

Claimant: Respondent (6)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) - Layoff Iowa Code § 17A.12(3) – Default Decision Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.14(7) – Dismissal of Appeal on Default

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the September 17, 2020, reference 01, decision that held the claimant was eligible for benefits, provided the claimant met all other eligibility requirements, and that the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant was laid off on March 17, 2020 due to a lack of work. A notice of hearing was mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record for a telephone hearing to be held at 9:30 a.m. on November 16, 2020. The employer/appellant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions to register a number for the hearing, but named participants and provided a telephone number in the appeal. However, the employer was not available at the provided number at the time set for the hearing and did not participate. The claimant did not provide a telephone number for the appeal hearing and did not participate. Based upon the employer/appellant's failure to participate in the hearing and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

## ISSUE:

Should the appeal be dismissed based upon the employer/appellant not participating in the hearing?

## **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The employer is the appellant in this matter. The employer was properly notified of the appeal hearing set for 9:30 a.m. lowa time (Central Standard Time) on November 16, 2020 through the hearing notice that was mailed to the employer's last-known address of record on October 19, 2020. The employer did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. The employer did not comply with the hearing notice instructions to register a telephone number for the appeal hearing. The employer named Elle Morsan, Finance Manager, and Vikas Chander, President, in the appeal and provided a telephone number and extension where they could be reached for the appeal hearing. At the time of the hearing, neither employer representative/participant was available at the number provided in the appeal. The administrative law judge made three attempts to reach the

employer. On the first attempt, the administrative law judge was routed to the main number before he could enter the extension. Someone picked up the phone and promptly hung up the phone. On the second attempt, the administrative law judge dialed the extension, but no one answered. The administrative law judge left the phone ring 12 times before an answering system kicked in and the administrative law judge left an appropriate message. On the third attempt, the administrative law judge dialed the extension, but no one answered. The administrative law judge left the phone ring 10 times before an answering system kicked in and the administrative law judge left an appropriate message. As of the entry of this decision, the employer has not appeared for the hearing or responded to the administrative law judge's voicemail messages.

The September 17, 2020, reference 01, decision held the claimant was eligible for benefits, provided the claimant met all other eligibility requirements, and that the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant was laid off on March 17, 2020 due to a lack of work.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The Iowa Administrative Procedures Act at Iowa Code § 17A.12(3) provides in pertinent part:

If a party fails to appear or participate in a contested case proceeding after proper service of notice, the presiding officer may, if no adjournment is granted, enter a default decision or proceed with the hearing and make a decision in the absence of the party. ... If a decision is rendered against a party who failed to appear for the hearing and the presiding officer is timely requested by that party to vacate the decision for good cause, the time for initiating a further appeal is stayed pending a determination by the presiding officer to grant or deny the request. If adequate reasons are provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall vacate the decision and, after proper service of notice, conduct another evidentiary hearing. If adequate reasons are not provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall deny the motion to vacate.

Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-26.14(7) provides:

- (7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals bureau with the names and telephone numbers of the persons who are participating in the hearing by the scheduled starting time of the hearing or is not available at the telephone number provided, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing. If the appealing party fails to provide a telephone number or is unavailable for the hearing, the presiding officer may decide the appealing party is in default and dismiss the appeal as provide in lowa Code section 17A.12(3). The record may be reopened if the absent party makes a request to reopen the hearing in writing under subrule 26.8(3) and shows good cause for reopening the hearing.
- a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.
- b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

The employer/appellant appealed the representative's decision but failed to participate in the hearing. The employer/appellant has therefore defaulted on its appeal pursuant to lowa Code §17A.12(3) and lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.14(7), and the representative's decision remains in force and effect.

## **DECISION:**

The employer defaulted on its appeal. The appeal is dismissed. The September 17, 2020, reference 01, decision that held the claimant was eligible for benefits, provided the claimant met all other eligibility requirements, and that the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant was laid off on March 17, 2020 due to a lack of work, remains in effect.

James E. Timberland Administrative Law Judge

November 20, 2020

James & Timberland

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/rr