

**BEFORE THE  
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
Lucas State Office Building  
Fourth floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

---

**LORRETTA I LERCH**

Claimant,

and

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**HEARING NUMBER: 15B-UI-11275**

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD  
DECISION**

**NOTICE**

**THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL** unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT IS FILED WITHIN 30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A **REHEARING REQUEST** shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

**SECTION: 96.3-5-B-1**

**DECISION**

**UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE ALLOWED IF OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The issue of timeliness was raised when the Claimant filed an appeal that was received December 19, 2014, 10 days beyond the statutory deadline of December 9, 2014. The reason for the delay was because the Claimant only received the Nunc Pro Tunc Notice of Decision that was dated December 4, 2014 (original decision dated November 24, 2014, but not received). For this reason, we find good cause has been established for the late appeal, and the board shall consider it to be timely.

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

A portion of the Claimant's appeal to the Employment Appeal Board consisted of additional evidence (documents) which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the

administrative law judge. While the appeal and additional evidence were reviewed, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision.

---

Kim D. Schmett

---

Ashley R. Koopmans

---

James M. Strohman

AMG/fnv