

**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**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-07335-DT  
OC: 06/19/05 R: 03  
Claimant: Appellant (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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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.

**BARBARA A MURFIELD  
LOT 39  
2235 LINCOLN WAY  
CEDAR FALLS IA 50613**

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.

**BERTCH CABINET MFG INC  
PO BOX 2280  
WATERLOO IA 50704-2280**

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 17A.12-3 – Non-appearance of Party  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record  
871 IAC 26.14(7) – Late Call

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

An appeal was filed from a representative's unemployment insurance decision dated July 13, 2005 (reference 01) that concluded Barbara A. Murfield (claimant/appellant) was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from Bertch Cabinet Manufacturing, Inc. (employer/respondent). A telephone hearing was originally scheduled for 2:00 a.m. on August 3, 2005. The claimant received the hearing notice and responded by calling the Appeals Section on July 29, 2005. She indicated to the administrative law judge that she needed to reschedule for sometime in the morning, and agreed that she would be able to do the hearing at 8:30 a.m. on August 10, 2005. A corrected hearing notice was sent out to the

parties to confirm the change in time and date, and on August 8, 2005 the claimant recontacted the Appeals Section to confirm that she would be available at the scheduled time for the hearing at telephone number 319/961-6967. However, when the administrative law judge called that number at the scheduled time for the hearing, the claimant was not available. Therefore, the claimant did not participate in the hearing. The employer responded to the hearing notice and indicated that Mitzi Tann would participate as the employer's representative with another witness. When the administrative law judge contacted Ms. Tann for the hearing, she requested that the administrative law judge make a determination based upon a review of the information in the administrative file. The administrative law judge considered the record closed at 8:40 p.m. At 9:19 a.m., the claimant called the Appeals Section and requested that the record be reopened. 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 failed to be available at the scheduled day and time set for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. The reason the claimant did not participate in the hearing was that she had taken some medication and overslept through the time for the hearing. 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 Section 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 26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals section with the names and telephone numbers of its witnesses by the scheduled time of the hearing, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall

not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

The claimant was not available for the hearing until after the record had been closed. Oversleeping and missing the hearing, even due to taking medication, is not good cause. She had made a special arrangement to have the hearing scheduled at that time of day, and should have made special arrangements to ensure that taking the medication would not prevent her from waking up in time for the hearing. The claimant did not establish good cause to reopen the hearing. Therefore, the claimant's request to reopen the hearing is denied.

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).

DECISION:

The representative's unemployment insurance decision dated July 13, 2005 (reference 01) is affirmed. The decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits remains in effect.

ld/tjc