

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**JOYCE CHAPMAN**  
Claimant

**IOWA WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**APPEAL 21A-UI-12126-LJ-T  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 03/29/20  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Public Law, Sec. 2104 – Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation  
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

On May 3, 2021, the claimant Joyce Chapman appealed the April 8, 2021, (reference 04) decision that concluded the claimant was overpaid Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (“FPUC”) benefits in the amount of \$4,800.00 for the eight-week period ending July 25, 2020. A telephone hearing was held at 8:00 a.m. on Friday, July 23, 2021, pursuant to due notice. Appeals 21A-UI-12123-LJ-T, 21A-UI-12125-LJ-T, and 21A-UI-12126-LJ-T were heard together and created one record. The claimant, Joyce Chapman, participated. No exhibits were offered or admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

**ISSUE:**

Whether claimant is overpaid FPUC benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant filed for and has received FPUC benefits in the gross amount of \$4,800.00 for the eight-week period ending July 25, 2020.

On November 23, 2020, Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) issued a decision (reference 01) that disqualified claimant from receiving regular unemployment insurance benefits. That decision has been affirmed. See 21A-UI-01121-S1-T. Claimant then appealed to the Employment Appeal Board, who affirmed the administrative law judge’s decision. See 21B-UI-01121. Claimant did not appeal that decision to district court.

Three overpayment decisions were mailed to claimant's last known address of record on April 8, 2021. Claimant believes she received the decisions. The decisions each contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by April 18, 2021. The appeal was not filed until May 3, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the overpayment decisions. Claimant offered no explanation for the delay in appealing the decisions.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the appellant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part: “[u]nless 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.”

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

1. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

(a) If transmitted via the United States Postal Service 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 is 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.

(b) If transmitted via the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.

(c) If transmitted by any means other than [United States Postal Service or the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES)], on the date it is received by the division.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

2. The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

The Iowa 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). 00194 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).

In this case, the administrative law judge is not convinced that claimant received the overpayment decision at issue. Claimant went through numerous documents in her possession during the hearing, and none of them seemed to be any of the three overpayment decisions on for hearing. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists.

See *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

PL 116-136, Sec. 2104 provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Provisions of Agreement

(1) Federal pandemic unemployment compensation.--Any agreement under this section shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of regular compensation to individuals in amounts and to the extent that they would be determined if the State law of the State were applied, with respect to any week for which the individual is (disregarding this section) otherwise entitled under the State law to receive regular compensation, as if such State law had been modified in a manner such that the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable for any week shall be equal to

(A) the amount determined under the State law (before the application of this paragraph), plus

(B) an additional amount of \$600 (in this section referred to as "Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation").

....

(f) Fraud and Overpayments

(2) Repayment.--In the case of individuals who have received amounts of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(A) the payment of such Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual; and

(B) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

Section 203 of the Continued Assistance for Unemployed Workers Act of 2020 provides in pertinent part:

(a) IN GENERAL. – Section 2104(e) of the CARES Act (15 U.S.C. 9023(e)) is amended to read as follows: . . .

“(e) APPLICABILITY. – An agreement entered into under this section shall apply –

(1) to weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which such agreement is entered into and ending on or before July 31, 2020; and

(2) to weeks of unemployment beginning after December 26, 2020 (or, if later, the date on which such agreement is entered into), and ending on or before March 14, 2021.”.

(b) AMOUNT.-

(1) IN GENERAL. – Section 2104(b) of the CARES Act (15 U.S.C. 9023(b)) is amended –

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “of \$600” and inserting “equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3)”; and

(B) by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

“(3) AMOUNT OF FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.-

“(A) IN GENERAL. – The amount specified in this paragraph is the following amount:

“(i) For weeks of unemployment beginning after the date on which an agreement is entered into under this section and ending on or before July 31, 2020, \$600.

“(ii) For weeks of unemployment beginning after December 26, 2020 (or, if later, the date on which such agreement is entered into), and ending on or before March 14, 2021, \$300.”.

The decision that denied claimant regular unemployment insurance benefits remains in effect. Because claimant is not eligible for UI benefits, claimant is also not eligible for FPUC benefits. Therefore, claimant has received FPUC benefits to which they were not entitled. The administrative law judge concludes that claimant has been overpaid FPUC benefits in the amount outlined in the findings of fact above. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with Iowa law.

**DECISION:**

The April 8, 2021 (reference 04) decision is affirmed. Claimant has been overpaid FPUC benefits in the amount of \$4,800.00, which must be repaid.



---

Elizabeth A. Johnson  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax (515)478-3528

July 29, 2021  
Decision Dated and Mailed

lj/ol

**NOTE TO CLAIMANT:**

- This decision determines you have been overpaid FPUC 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.
- You may also request a waiver of this overpayment. The written request must include the following information:
  1. Claimant name & address.
  2. Decision number/date of decision.
  3. Dollar amount of overpayment requested for waiver.
  4. Relevant facts that you feel would justify a waiver.
- The request should be sent to:

Iowa Workforce Development  
Overpayment waiver request  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, IA 50319
- This Information can also be found on the Iowa Workforce Development website at: <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-overpayment-and-recovery>.
- If this decision becomes final and you are not eligible for a waiver, you will have to repay the benefits you received.