## IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

DAN SCHILLING Claimant

# APPEAL 21A-UI-15629-DB-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

> OC: 08/04/19 Claimant: Appellant (1)

PL 116-136 Sec 2107 – Federal Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the August 17, 2020 (reference 09) unemployment insurance decision that denied Federal Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC) benefits effective April 19, 2020 because he would be monetarily eligible for benefits in Illinois. The claimant was properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 24, 2021. The claimant participated personally. The administrative law judge took administrative notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records. The hearing was consolidated with Appeal No. 21A-UI-15630-DB-T and 21A-UI-15631-DB-T.

#### **ISSUES:**

Is the appeal considered timely? Is the claimant eligible for Federal Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An unemployment insurance benefits decision dated August 17, 2020 (reference 09) was mailed to the claimant's correct address of record. The claimant never received the decision in the mail. The decision stated that an appeal must be filed by August 27, 2020 with the Appeals Bureau. The claimant filed an appeal on July 11, 2021, after receiving an overpayment of PEUC benefits decision.

The claimant filed an initial claim for regular unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa with an effective date of August 4, 2019. He received him maximum benefit amount for regular unemployment insurance benefits and began receiving PEUC benefits effective April 19, 2020. He received PEUC benefits in the amount of \$250.00 for the week-ending April 25, 2020. Claimant also received FPUC benefits in the amount of \$600.00 for the week-ending April 25, 2020 as a supplement to his PEUC payment.

Claimant worked in Illinois at Cortech for approximately three months in 2019. Claimant's administrative records indicate that he had sufficient insured wages in Illinois from which he

would be eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits in the State of Illinois with a combined wage claim. Claimant was able to and available for work effective April 19, 2020.

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

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes as follows:

The first issue is whether the claimant's appeal shall be considered timely. The administrative law judge finds that it shall.

lowa Code § 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. 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 disgualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of § 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disgualified for benefits pursuant to § 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disgualified for benefits in cases involving § 96.5. subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to § 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disgualified for benefits in cases involving § 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding § 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins 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. Bd. of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (lowa 1976).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the

division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.

b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.

c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.

d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

In this case, the claimant never received the initial denial decision, presumably due to postal error or delay. As such, the delay in the claimant filing the appeal was due delay by the United States postal services and the appeal shall be considered timely.

The next issue is whether the claimant was eligible for PEUC benefits in the State of Iowa effective April 19, 2020. The administrative law judge finds that he was not because he was eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits in the State of Illinois on a combined wage claim.

PL 116-136 Sec 2107 provides in pertinent part:

PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS. —

(1) IN GENERAL. — Any State which desires to do so may enter into and participate in an agreement under this section with the Secretary of Labor (in this section referred to as the "Secretary"). Any State which is a party to an agreement under this section may, upon providing 30 days' written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(2) PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT. ---

Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of pandemic emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who—

(A) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law or under Federal law with respect to a benefit year (excluding any benefit year that ended before July 1, 2019);

(B) have no rights to regular compensation with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law;

(C) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada; and

(D) are able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work.

The claimant had exhausted his maximum benefit amount for regular unemployment insurance benefits funded by the State of Iowa effective April 19, 2020. He had insured wages in the State of Illinois for which he would be eligible for benefits using his Cortech wages and remaining Iowa wages on a combined wage claim. As such, the claimant did not meet the eligibility for federal Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation benefits effective April 19, 2020 as he was eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits in another State.

### **DECISION:**

The appeal shall be considered timely. The August 17, 2020 (reference 09) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The claimant was not eligible for Federal Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC) benefits in Iowa effective April 19, 2020 because he was eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits in the State of Illinois.

Dawn. Moucher

Dawn Boucher Administrative Law Judge

September 29, 2021 Decision Dated and Mailed

db/mh