

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JOHN G WINDSCHITL
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-10739-LT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CORINTHIAN MIDWEST VENTURES LLC
Employer

OC: 03/16/09
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Leaving
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the June 1, 2009, reference 02, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on August 19, 2009. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Blair Overton. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether claimant's appeal is timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A disqualification decision was mailed to claimant's last-known address of record on June 1, 2009. He did receive the decision within the appeal period but agreed with the separation decision with respect to this employer. The decision contained a warning "If this decision denies benefits and is not reversed on appeal it may result in an overpayment which you will be required to repay." It also warned that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by June 11, 2009. The appeal was not filed until July 27, 2009, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes claimant's appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address

to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. *Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Board of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. 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). 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). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. *Hendren v. IESC*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The postage meter mark on the last day for filing does not perfect a timely appeal if the postmark affixed by the United States Postal Service is beyond the filing date. *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Cedar Rapids v. EAB*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The administrative law judge concludes that failure to follow the clear written instructions to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law *was not due to*

any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to 871 IAC 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See, *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The June 1, 2009, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

NOTE OF EXPLANATION: The ALJ inquired about why a Notice of Claim was not sent to this employer until March 22, 2009 and was advised that when claimant filed his web claim effective March 16, 2008, he listed Nationwide as his most recent employer when he was still employed with Corinthian through March 31, 2008. It was not until claimant filed for a second claim year (and still reported Nationwide as the last employer with a separation date of May 1, 2007) that Corinthian fell into the base period and the agency became aware that there was a second, more recent employer than Nationwide. Because the separation from Corinthian is disqualifying based upon the timeliness issue, the benefits paid in error since the March 31, 2008 separation must be recovered regardless of qualification or eligibility based upon the Nationwide separation.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs