

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

MARIA L YEPEZ
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 08O-UI-02413-DT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

PURFOODS LLC
Employer

OC: 04/22/07 R: 02
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit
871 IAC 24.25(4) – Voluntary Quit by Three-day No-Call, No-Show
§ 17A.12-3 – Non-appearance of Party
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

An appeal was filed from a representative's unemployment insurance decision dated January 25, 2008 (reference 02) that concluded Maria L. Yepez (claimant/appellant) was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from PurFoods, L.L.C. (employer/respondent). Notices of hearing were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record for a telephone hearing to be held at 9:00 a.m. on March 28, 2008. The claimant/appellant failed to respond to the hearing notice and provide a telephone number at which she could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing.

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:

Should the representative's decision be affirmed on a basis of a review of the available information?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant's appeal to the representative's decision was filed on January 30, 2008; on that appeal the claimant listed her address as 709 New Castle Road., Marshalltown, IA, 50158. That was the same address to which the representative's decision had been mailed on January 25, 2008, which the claimant indicated on her appeal she had received on January 29, 2008. A notice for a hearing on the claimant's appeal was sent to that same address on February 1, 2008 for a hearing to be held on February 13, 2008 under 08A-UI-01010-MT. The claimant did not respond to that hearing notice or respond by providing a telephone number at which she could participate in that hearing, so on February 14, 2008 the administrative law judge in that matter issued a decision affirming the representative's decision based upon a

review of the available information. That administrative law judge's decision was mailed also to the 709 New Castle Road address in Marshalltown.

On February 19, 2008 the claimant appealed the administrative law judge's decision to the Employment Appeal Board, indicating that she received neither the hearing notice for the February 1 hearing nor the administrative law judge's decision issued February 14. On that appeal to the Board the claimant again confirmed her address as 709 New Castle Road in Marshalltown. Based upon the claimant's assertion of non-receipt of the hearing notice, on March 6 the Board remanded the matter back to the Appeals Section for a new hearing.

As a result of the remand, a new appeal was established under 08O-UI-02413-DT, the current proceeding. On March 13, 2008 a new notice of hearing was sent to the claimant's 709 New Castle Road address in Marshalltown setting a hearing for March 27, 2008. No response was made by the claimant to that hearing notice either before or after an additional hearing notice was issued and mailed on March 25 to the claimant's 709 New Castle Road address rescheduling the hearing to March 28, 2008. None of the hearing notices have been returned to the Appeals Section as non-deliverable.

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to provide a telephone number at which she 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 has conducted a careful review of the administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The Iowa Administrative Procedures Act at Iowa Code § 17A.12-3 provides in pertinent part:

If a party fails to appear or participate in a contested case proceeding after proper service of notice, the presiding officer may, if no adjournment is granted, enter a default decision or proceed with the hearing and make a decision in the absence of the party. ... If a decision is rendered against a party who failed to appear for the hearing and the presiding officer is timely requested by that party to vacate the decision for good cause, the time for initiating a further appeal is stayed pending a determination by the presiding officer to grant or deny the request. If adequate reasons are provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall vacate the decision and, after proper service of notice, conduct another evidentiary hearing. If adequate reasons are not provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall deny the motion to vacate.

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. 871 IAC 26.8(5).

Pursuant to the rule, the appellant must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of this decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause that prevented the appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

DECISION:

The representative's unemployment insurance decision dated January 25, 2008 (reference 02) is affirmed. The decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits remains in effect. This decision will become final unless a written request establishing good cause to reopen the record is made to the administrative law judge within 15 days of the date of this decision.

Lynette A. F. Donner
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/css