IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

MALINDA ALLEN Claimant

APPEAL 22A-UI-08050-CS-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

HYVEE INC Employer

> OC: 09/02/18 Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Ability to and Availability for Work Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(10) – Leave of Absence

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On March 21, 2022, the claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the March 23, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits effective March 29, 2020, based on claimant requesting and granted a leave of absence. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 12, 2022. Appeal numbers 22A-UI-08051-CS-T, and 22A-UI-08052-CS-T were heard together and created one record. Claimant participated. Employer did not call in to participate. Administrative notice was taken of claimant's file. Specifically the administrative law judge took notice of a letter dated April 7, 2021, Ref. 99. The administrative law judge marked this letter as exhibit D-1 after the hearing concluded and included it in the claimant's appeal file.

ISSUES:

- I. Is claimant's appeal timely?
- II. Is the claimant able to and available for work?
- III. Is the claimant on an approved leave of absence?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on March 23, 2021. Claimant received the decision within the appeal period. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by April 2, 2021. The appeal was not filed until March 21, 2022. Claimant did not file an appeal because she believe she qualified for benefits based on the April 7, 2021, Ref. 99 decision. (Exhibit D-1). This decision was mailed to claimant after the appeal period had passed for the Ref. 01 decision.

The letter informed claimant that she was:

"eligible to receive a weekly Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC) benefit... If you are entitled to receive regular unemployment benefits or if you to meet all other eligibility requirements, you will no longer be eligible for PEUC benefits." (Exhibit D-1).

Claimant received the March 10, 2022, overpayment decisions and then filed her appeal.

Claimant began working for employer on October 17, 2018. Claimant was a part-time food demonstrator. During the week of March 29, 2020, claimant had a discussion with Shauna from Human Resources about her job. Claimant does not recall the conversation but does know that she was not going to be scheduled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The employer called her back to work in April 2021 and claimant returned to work.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal is untimely.

lowa 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 disgualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of § 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to § 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 § 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to § 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving § 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 § 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. Bd. of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976). Pursuant to rules Iowa Admin. Code r. 871- 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). The postage meter mark on the last day for filing does not perfect a timely appeal if the postmark affixed by the United States Postal Service is beyond the filing date. *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Cedar Rapids v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990).

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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 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 Iowa 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 Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The March 23, 2021, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is AFFIRMED. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Carly Smith

Carly Smith Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau

June 6, 2022 Decision Dated and Mailed

cs/kmj

NOTE TO CLAIMANT: This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision, you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision.

Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits, but who were unemployed between February 2, 2020, and June 12, 2021, unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. To apply for PUA go to https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/unemployment-insurance-appeals in the last paragraph under "WHAT TO EXPECT FROM THE HEARING." The authorization number is 108050.

If this decision becomes final or if you are not eligible for PUA, you may have an overpayment of benefits.