

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**IGOR TICAC**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-10218-H2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**GENESIS DEVELOPMENT**  
Employer

**OC: 08-21-11**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated August 16, 2012, reference 04, that denied benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for September 19, 2012. The appellant did respond to the hearing notice instructions but was not available when the hearing was called and did not participate in the hearing because the telephone number he provided rang. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the representative's decision should be affirmed.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to provide a telephone number at which he could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. The administrative law judge attempted to contact the claimant more than once to begin the hearing. His telephone constantly rang busy. The claimant did not make himself available at the telephone number he provided he could be reached at for the hearing.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 16, 2012, reference 04, is affirmed. The representative's decision remains in effect. Benefits are denied.

---

Teresa K. Hillary  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

tkh/kjw