

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

ARMANDO C HERNANDEZ
PO BOX 454
SCHLESWIG IA 51461 0454

TYSON FRESH MEATS INC
c/o TALX UCM SERVICES INC
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166 0283

Appeal Number: 06A-UI-03254-DWT
OC: 10/23/05 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party request the Appeals Section to reopen the record at the address listed at the top of this decision or appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

871 IAC 26.8(5) - Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc. (employer) appealed a representative's March 10, 2006 decision (reference 07) that concluded Armando C. Hernandez (claimant) was qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits and the employer's account could be charged for benefits because the claimant had been discharged for nondisqualifying reasons. A telephone hearing was scheduled for April 11, 2006. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer responded to the hearing notice, but the employer's witness was not available for the hearing. A message was left for the employer to contact the Appeals Section if the employer wanted to participate in the hearing. The employer did not contact the Appeals Section. Based on the administrative file and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The employer provided a telephone number at which the representative could be reached for the hearing, but the employer's witness was not available for the hearing. The employer did not request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

Pursuant to the rule and Iowa Code § 17A.12-3, the employer must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of this decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause that prevented the employer from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

DECISION:

The representative's March 10, 2006 decision (reference 07) is affirmed. The decision holding the claimant qualified for benefits as of February 19, 2006, remains in effect. The employer is

not a base period employer and will not be charged for benefits paid to the claimant. This decision will become final unless a written request establishing good cause to reopen the record is made to the administrative law judge within 15 days of the date of this decision.

dlw/tjc