

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**LOTTIE COMPARAN**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 09A-UI-14595-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**INTERACTIVE TELESERVICES CORP**

Employer

**OC: 07/05/09**

**Claimant: Appellant (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge for Misconduct

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Lottie Comparan (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated September 18, 2009, reference 01, which held that she was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because she voluntarily quit her employment with Interactive Teleservices Corporation (employer) without good cause attributable to the employer. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on October 27, 2009. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Corey Ream, Night Shift Sales Manager. Employer witnesses Amanda Lewis and Meadow Hopejoy were present but offered no testimony. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant's appeal is timely, and if so, whether the employer discharged her for work-related misconduct?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on September 18, 2009. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by September 28, 2009. The claimant was out of town and did not return until September 29, 2009. She filed her appeal on that same date.

The claimant was employed as a full-time quality assurance analyst September 2, 2008 through February 5, 2009. On an unknown date, the claimant was taken to the hospital from work by ambulance. She did not return to work. The claimant said she provided the employer with medical documentation but the employer testified the documentation only covered three days. The employer could not provide her last work date or the dates that were unexcused. The claimant was subsequently fired for excessive unexcused absenteeism.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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 record shows that the appellant did not have a reasonable opportunity to file a

timely appeal because she did not receive the disqualification decision until after the due date. Without timely notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was due the claimant being out of town. The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge has 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).

The substantive issue to be determined in this case is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a.

Iowa Code § 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for excessive unexcused absenteeism but the employer was unable to provide any specific or detailed evidence regarding these absences or the last day of work. When misconduct is alleged as the reason

for the discharge and subsequent disqualification of benefits, it is incumbent upon the employer to present evidence in support of its allegations. Allegations of misconduct or dishonesty without additional evidence shall not be sufficient to result in disqualification. 871 IAC 24.32(4). The employer failed to meet its burden. Work-connected misconduct has not been established in this case and benefits are allowed.

**DECISION:**

The claimant's appeal was timely. The unemployment insurance decision dated September 18, 2009, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant was discharged. Misconduct has not been established. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css