IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section 1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319 DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE 68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

RAYMOND L KNUTSON 113 S 5TH ST FORT DODGE IA 50501

ELECTROLUX HOME PRODUCTS INC FRIGIDAIRE °/_o TALX EMPLOYER SVCS PO BOX 1160 COLUMBUS OH 43216-1160 Appeal Number: 05A-UI-12038-LT

OC: 10-24-04 R: 01 Claimant: Respondent (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the *Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.*

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

- The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
- 2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
- That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
- 4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)	
(Decision Dated & Mailed)	

871 IAC 24.19(1) – Determination and Review of Benefit Rights 871 IAC 24.28(6-8) – Prior Adjudication

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the November 17, 2005, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits based upon an allowance decision in a prior benefit year for the same separation. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on December 14, 2005. Claimant did not participate. Employer did participate through Mallory Russell. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The decision at issue has been adjudicated in a prior claim year and that decision has become final.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the decision at issue has been adjudicated in a prior claim year and that decision has become final.

871 IAC 24.28(6) provides:

Voluntary guit regualifications and previously adjudicated voluntary guit issues.

(6) The claimant voluntarily left employment. However, there shall be no disqualification under lowa Code section 96.5(1) if a decision on this same separation has been made on a prior claim by a representative of the department and such decision has become final.

871 IAC 24.19(1) provides:

Claims for benefits shall be promptly determined by the department on the basis of such facts as it may obtain. Notice of such determination shall be promptly given to each claimant and to any employer whose employment relationship with the claimant, or the claimant's separation therefrom, involves actual or potential disqualifying issues relevant to the determination. . . . The notice of appeal rights shall state clearly the place and manner for taking an appeal from the determination and the period within which an appeal may be taken. Unless the claimant or any other such party entitled to notice, within ten days after such notification was mailed to such claimant's last-known address, files with the department a written request for a review of or an appeal from such determination, such determination shall be final.

The issue presented was resolved in a prior claim year (original claim date October 24, 2004) as the representative's decision dated November 22, 2004, reference 01. The current decision referring to the prior claim year decision is affirmed.

DECISION:

The November 17, 2005, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The prior decision on the separation remains in effect.

dml/kjw