

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

MAT A JESS

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 06A-UI-09252-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

L A LEASING INC

SEDONA STAFFING

Employer

**OC: 06/04/06 R: 03
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Mat Jess filed an appeal from the August 3, 2006, reference 05, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on October 2, 2006. Mr. Jess participated. Unemployment Insurance Administrator Colleen McGuinty represented the employer. The administrative law judge took official notice of the Agency's administrative file and received Department Exhibits D-1 and D-2 into evidence.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant's appeal was timely. It was not.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The August 3, 2006, reference 05, decision was mailed to Mat Jess' last known address of record on August 3, 2006. That address of record was 600 Ashton Place N.E, Apt. 102, Cedar Rapids, IA, 52402-8331. The weight of the evidence indicates that the decision was received at the address of record in a timely fashion, prior to the deadline for appeal. At the time, Mr. Jess was in the process of relocating to a new residence. Throughout the month of August, Mr. Jess did not check his mail at the old address. Instead, Mr. Jess was content to let his former landlord deal with his mail. Mr. Jess did not make any arrangements to have the post office forward his mail until the end of August. It was then another week or more before Mr. Jess attempted to contact Iowa Workforce Development. Mr. Jess did not provide Iowa Workforce Development with a new address of record until the second week of September, at which time the Agency immediately commenced directing correspondence to the new address.

The August 8, 2006, reference 05, decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by August 13, 2006. The decision also indicated that if the deadline for appeal fell on a Sunday, the deadline would be extended to the next working day. August 13 was a Sunday and the next working day was Monday, August 14. The appeal was not filed until September 18, 2006, the day on which Mr. Jess' faxed appeal

was received at the Iowa Workforce Development Appeals Section. This was more than a month after the deadline for appeal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 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 disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 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 section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten-day deadline for appeal begins to run on the date Workforce Development mails the decision to the parties. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the Agency 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 (Iowa 1976).

An appeal submitted by mail is deemed filed on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it was received, or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion. See 871 AC 24.35(1)(a). See also Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). An appeal submitted by any other means is deemed filed on the date it is received by the Unemployment Insurance Division of Iowa Workforce Development. See 871 IAC 24.35(1)(b).

The evidence in the record establishes that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The Iowa 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 (Iowa 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 (Iowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 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 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to receive and review the decision denying benefits and to file a timely appeal, but made himself unavailable to receive correspondence from Iowa Workforce Development.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. See 871 IAC 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa 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 (Iowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The Agency representative's August 3, 2006, reference 05, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/kjw