

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JENNIFER M SKINNER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-00530-MT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ALDI INC-KANSAS
Employer

OC: 09/01/13
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-7 – Vacation Pay
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated January 7, 2014, reference 03, that concluded claimant was not eligible for three weeks. A hearing was scheduled for February 6, 2014. The appellant and employer did not participate in the hearing. The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. As shown on the Clear 2 There hearing control screen, there is no telephone number listed for the appellant and employer. This proves that the appellant failed, prior to the hearing date and time, to provide a telephone number at which appellant could be reached for the hearing and did not participate for that reason. Furthermore, appellant did not request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice instructions.

Based on 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. The administrative file is admitted as Exhibit One and official notice is taken of the Clear 2 There hearing control screen proving that Appellant did not call prior to the start of hearing. Fact-finding note are not part of the administrative file unless requested by the parties as shown by the hearing notice instructions, "Information submitted for the fact-finding interview is not automatically part of the record..."

ISSUE:

The issue is whether vacation pay was deducted for the correct period and amount from unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. Having reviewed all of the available evidence in the administrative record, the administrative law judge finds: The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. As shown on the Clear2There hearing control screen, there is not a phone number listed for the appellant. This means the appellant failed, prior to the hearing date and time, to provide a telephone number at

which they could be reached for the hearing and did not participate or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice instructions. There is no evidence the hearing notice was returned by the postal service as undeliverable.

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 January 7, 2014, reference 03, is affirmed. The decision disqualifying claimant from receiving benefits for three weeks ending September 21, 2013, 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.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge
Iowa Workforce Development
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-242-5144

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/pjs