

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**HOLLY A SHERIDAN
2065 NASH BLVD APT F4
COUNCIL BLUFFS IA 51501-0985**

**WAL-MART STORES INC
C/o FRICK UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283**

**Appeal Number: 06A-UI-02982-JTT
OC: 01/29/06 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

871 IAC 26.8(5) - Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Wal-Mart appealed from an unemployment insurance decision dated February 28, 2006, reference 01, that allowed benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for April 3, 2006. The appellant provided a telephone number for the hearing, but a representative was not available at that number at the scheduled time of the hearing. Claimant Holly Sheridan was available for 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.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant, Wal-Mart, responded to the hearing notice instructions and provided a telephone number at which a representative could be reached for the hearing: Dano Villar and/or Donna Doran at 712-366-3326. At the scheduled time of the hearing, the administrative law judge made contact with Wal-Mart and spoke with Community Involvement Coordinator Linda Rhatigan. Ms. Rhatigan advised that Mr. Villar had transferred out of the Council Bluffs Wal-Mart and that Ms. Doran was on vacation during the week of the hearing. The administrative law judge requested that Ms. Rhatigan inquire as to whether a Wal-Mart representative was available to represent the employer for the hearing. Ms. Rhatigan checked with Co-Manager Jennifer Kanenwisher. Ms. Kanenwisher instructed Ms. Rhatigan to report to the administrative law judge that the employer would not be participating in the hearing because no one with knowledge of the claimant's employment was available to represent the employer. The appellant did not 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:

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.

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 unemployment insurance decision dated February 28, 2006, reference 01, is affirmed. The decision allowing 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.

jt/kkf