

**BEFORE THE  
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
Lucas State Office Building  
Fourth floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

---

**NAGLA MOHAMED**

Claimant

and

**WALMART INC**

Employer

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**HEARING NUMBER: 20B-UI-04290**

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
DECISION**

**NOTICE**

**THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL** unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION: 96.4-3, 96.3-7**

**DECISION**

**UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED**

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

The Claimant should note that **this is not a Pandemic Unemployment Assistance case**. The criteria she cites apply only to Pandemic Unemployment Assistance. The records we can access indicate that the Claimant has applied for and been approved for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance as of July 24, 2020.

If she has not done so the Claimant should ask for backdating of her PUA claim to the week beginning March 15, 2020. *See UIPL 16-20, Attachment I, Change 1* (DOLETA 4/27/2020) ("An individual does not need to demonstrate good cause to backdate a PUA claim...")

**To be clear today's denial is for regular benefits only and does not affect the Claimant's PUA benefits.**

Claimant submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes

of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by Claimant was not presented at hearing. Accordingly, none of the new and additional information submitted has been relied upon in making our decision, and none of it has received any weight whatsoever, but rather all of it has been wholly disregarded.

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

---

James M. Strohman

---

Myron R. Linn

RRA/fnv