IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

KALI L WIESE

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 21A-UI-19585-B2T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

JP MANOR LLC

Employer

OC: 07/05/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

lowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal lowa Code § 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the October 21, 2020, reference 04, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 29, 2021. The claimant did participate. Employer did not participate.

ISSUES:

Whether the appeal is timely?

Whether claimant guit for good cause attributable to employer?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on October 21, 2020. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by October 31, 2020. The appeal was not filed until September 2, 2021, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Claimant stated she did receive the decision, but wasn't sure what needed to be done so she did not file an appeal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

lowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

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. . . . 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.

The ten calendar days for appeal begin 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 (lowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules lowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.2(96)(1) and lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (lowa 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 lowa 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 (lowa 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 (lowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 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 (lowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the lowa 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 lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to lowa Code Section 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 (lowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (lowa 1979).

DECISION:

The October 21, 2020, reference 04, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Blair A. Bennett

Administrative Law Judge

November 16, 2021_

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn