IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

KRISTINA M BUCHANAN

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-23294-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SALON ARIA LLC

Employer

OC: 03/15/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

Iowa Code § 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

Iowa Code § 96.4-3 – Able and Available

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the June 11, 2021, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on December 13, 2021. The claimant did participate and was represented by non-attorney witness Kai Buchanan and Mr. Buchanan also acted as a witness. The employer did participate through Christine McClimon. Claimant's exhibits A-B were admitted to the record.

ISSUES:

Whether the appeal is timely?
Whether claimant quit for good cause attributable to employer?
Whether claimant is able and available for work?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on June 11, 2021. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by June 21, 2021. The appeal was not filed until October 19, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant stated she did not receive this decision.

Claimant worked as a part time nail stylist for employer. On or around March 16, 2020 employer's salon was closed for Covid reasons. On May 16, 2021 the salon reopened and claimant's job was again available. Claimant opted not to return to work for a number of reasons. Those reasons included the fact that claimant's children were not in school for Covid. (It is noted that claimant's ineligibility only happened after 5-31 when school would not be in session.) Claimant additionally provided a doctor's note indicating claimant has asthma and could experience more serious effects were she to contract Covid. Claimant finally stated that she and her husband were expediting a planned move to Arizona for a new job claimant's husband accepted. Claimant's family accelerated this move into June.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

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. . . . 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.

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

Pursuant to rules Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.2(96)(1) and Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The lowa 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 not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal as she did not receive a decision denying her benefits.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was potentially due to an Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal is therefore deemed timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code Section 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge retains 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).

Iowa Code section 96.4(3) provides:

An unemployed individual shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the department finds that:

3. The individual is able to work, is available for work, and is earnestly and actively seeking work. This subsection is waived if the individual is deemed partially unemployed, while employed at the individual's regular job, as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "b", unnumbered paragraph (1), or temporarily unemployed as defined in section 96.19, subsection 38, paragraph "c". The work search requirements of this subsection and the disqualification requirement for failure to apply for, or to accept suitable work of section 96.5, subsection 3 are waived if the individual is not disqualified for benefits under section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraph "h".

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.25(10) provides:

Voluntary quit without good cause. In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer from whom the employee has separated. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to lowa Code section 96.5. However, the claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving lowa Code section 96.5, subsection (1), paragraphs "a" through "i," and subsection 10. The following reasons for a voluntary quit shall be presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer:

(10) The claimant left employment to accompany the spouse to a new locality.

Inasmuch as the claimant quit her employment as she was moving from Iowa to Arizona for her husband's new employment, claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment benefits from the date of June 1, 2021. The decision of the representative is affirmed.

Note to Claimant: This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at https://www.jowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information.

DECISION:

The June 11, 2021, reference 01, decision is affirmed. Although the appeal in this case was deemed timely, the decision of the representative remains in effect as claimant voluntarily quit her job to move to Arizona with her husband for his new job.

Blair A. Bennett

Administrative Law Judge

<u>January 14, 2022</u> Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/mh