

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TRACY M BEAL
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 14A-UI-04845-DT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

WORKSOURCE INC
Employer

OC: 12/09/12

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Tracy M. Beal (claimant) appealed a representative's December 17, 2013 decision (OC 12/09/12 – reference 02) that concluded she was not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits after a separation from employment from Worksource, Inc. (employer) which occurred on or about November 28, 2013. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 29, 2014. This appeal was consolidated for hearing with one related appeal, 14A-UI-04846-DT. The claimant participated in the hearing. Heather Parson appeared on the employer's behalf. During the hearing, Exhibit A-1 was entered 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:

Was the claimant's appeal timely or are there legal grounds under which it can be treated as timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The representative's decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on December 17, 2013. The claimant received the decision. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by Friday, December 27, 2013. The appeal was not filed until it was postmarked on May 9, 2014, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. Even though the claimant did not agree with the decision, she did not appeal in December because she decided that it was unlikely that she would win and she decided that she would just look for other employment. She did have some other employment after the employment with this employer, but has not yet earned at least \$750.00 in subsequent employment. She made her appeal when she did because she had established a new claim year effective April 30, 2014 after her more recent employment ended, and she learned that the decision regarding the separation from employment with this employer was still precluding her from being eligible to receive benefits.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

If a party fails to make a timely appeal of a representative's decision and there is no legal excuse under which the appeal can be deemed to have been made timely, the decision as to the merits has become final and is not subject to further review. Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides that unless the affected party (here, the claimant) files an appeal from the decision within ten calendar days, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied as set out by the decision.

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 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 then 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).

A party does not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal if the delay is due to Agency error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service. Rule 871 IAC 24.35(2). Failing to read and follow the instructions for filing an appeal is not a reason outside the appellant's control that deprived the appellant from having a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal, but chose not to do so.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the prescribed time was not due to a legally excusable reason so that it can be treated as timely. The administrative law judge further concludes that because the appeal was not timely, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal, regardless of whether the merits of the appeal would be valid. See, *Beardslee*, supra; *Franklin*, supra; and *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company v. Employment Appeal Board*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

DECISION:

The representative's December 17, 2013 decision (OC 12/09/12 – reference 02) is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative has become final and remains in full force and effect. From November 28, 2013, benefits are withheld until such time as the claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is then otherwise eligible. She has not yet requalified.

Lynette A. F. Donner
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

ld/pjs