IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEM PLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

RACHEL ALBERTSON (F/K/A RACHEL ARCHER)

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-03010-JT-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

JAI GANESH INC

Employer

OC: 03/22/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal lowa Code Section 96.4(3) – Able & Available

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed a late appeal from the October 26, 2020, reference 01, decision that denied benefits effective April 26, 2020, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence, was voluntarily unemployed, and was not available for work. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on March 15, 2021. Claimant participated. Amy Mortensen represented the employer. The hearing in this matter was consolidated with the hearing in Appeal Numbers 21A-Ul-03011-JT-T, 21A-Ul-03012-JT-T and 21A-Ul-3013-JT-T. Exhibits 1, 2, 3 and A through D were received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the following Agency administrative records: DBRO, KCCO, KPYX, the October 26, 2020, reference 01, decision, as well as the January 4, 2021, reference 02, reference 03 and reference 04, overpayment decisions.

ISSUE:

Whether the appeal was timely. Whether there is good cause to treat the appeal as timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On October 26, 2020, lowa Workforce Development mailed the October 26, 2020, reference 01, decision to the claimant's last-known address of record. The decision denied benefits effective April 26, 2020, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence, was voluntarily unemployed, and was not available for work. The decision stated that the decision would become final unless an appeal was postmarked by November 5, 2200 or received by the Appeals Bureau by that date. The decision include clear and concise instructions for filing an appeal. The claimant received the reference 01 decision in a timely manner, but did not take steps to file an appeal by the November 5, 2020 appeal deadline.

ONLINE RESOURCES:

UI law and administrative rules:

https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-law-and-administrative-rules UI Benefits Handbook:

 $\underline{\text{https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-claimant-handbook}}$

Employer UI Handbook: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/employer-handbook

Report UI fraud: https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/report-fraud

Employer account access and information: https://www.myiowaui.org/UITIPTaxWeb/

National Career Readiness Certificate and Skilled low a Initiative: http://skillediow.a.org/

On January 5, 2021 lowa Workforce Development mailed the January 4, 2021 reference 02, reference 03 and reference 04 overpayments to the claimant. Those decisions each included a January 14, 2021 deadline for appeal.

On January 13, 2021, the claimant filed an initial online appeal that did not reference a specific decision. Within a few minutes of the first appeal, the claimant filed a second online appeal from the reference 02 overpayment decision.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

lowa 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, subsections 10 and 11, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit 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 (lowa 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 lowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.35(1)(a). See also *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (lowa 1983). An appeal submitted

by any other means is deemed filed on the date it is received by the Unemployment Insurance Division of lowa Workforce Development. See lowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.35(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 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 (lowa 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 (lowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 1982). One question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in Hendren v. 217 N.W.2d 255 timely fashion. IESC. (lowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973).

The claimant's appeal from the October 26, 2020, reference 01, decision was untimely. The claimant received the decision in a timely manner, but did not take steps to file an appeal by the November 5, 2020 deadline or at any prior to January 13, 2021. Because the delay in filing the appeal was attributable to the claimant, and was not attributable to IWD or to the United States Postal Service, there is not good cause to treat the late appeal as a timely appeal. See lowa Administrative Code rule 871-24.35(2). Because the appeal was untimely, the administrative law judge does not have jurisdiction to disturb the October 26, 2020, reference 01, decision that denied benefits effective April 26, 2020, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence, was voluntarily unemployed, and was not available for work. See Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (lowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (lowa 1979).

DECISION:

The claimant's appeal from the October 26, 2020, reference 01, decision is untimely. The decision that denied benefits effective April 26, 2020, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant requested and was granted a leave of absence, was voluntarily unemployed, and was not available for work, remains in effect.

James E. Timberland

Pamer & Timberland

Administrative Law Judge

March 18, 2021

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/ol

NOTE TO CLAIMANT: This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits under state law. 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. If you do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits under state law and are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19, you may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment

Assistance (PUA). You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. For more information on how to apply for PUA, go to https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information. If you do not apply for and are not approved for PUA for the affected period, you will be required to repay the benefits you have received.