

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ERIKA L HUNTER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-06904-LT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 11/14/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the May 18, 2012 (reference 04) decision that found the claimant overpaid benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on July 5, 2012. Claimant participated with her father Anthony Hunter. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received.

ISSUES:

Is the claimant's appeal timely?

Did the claimant receive and is she obligated to repay the gross amount of unemployment insurance benefits received for the period in question?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A disqualification decision was mailed to claimant's last-known address of record at 1200 57th Street Clinton, Iowa 52732 on May 18, 2012. Her actual address was 1200 South 7th Street, Clinton, Iowa 52732, not 57th Street. She lived there when she filed her initial claim effective November 14, 2010 and received IWD mail at that address. She claimed benefits from then through January 22, 2011 when she found another job. She moved from there to her parents' home at 509 13th Avenue, Camanche, Iowa 52730-1749. In March 2012 she moved to 826 Gateway Avenue, Apartment 2, Clinton, Iowa. She did not notify IWD of either address change because she found another job and stopped claiming benefits. The overpayment decision was forwarded by the postal service to her parents' home address and received on June 4, 2012. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by May 28, 2012. The appeal was not filed until June 7, 2012, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision.

The overpayment issue in this case was created by a separation disqualification decision of an administrative law judge in appeal number 10A-UI-16763-BT dated January 27, 2011. The

employer participated in the initial fact-finding interview regarding the separation from employment. Claimant did receive gross benefits in the amount of \$2,470.00 for the ten-week period ending January 22, 2011.

Claimant was paid benefits for the following weeks:

Week ending	Gross benefit amount	
11/20/10	\$247.00	2010 Tax year benefits
11/27/10	247.00	
12/04/10	247.00	
12/11/10	247.00	
12/18/10	247.00	
12/25/10	247.00	
01/01/11	247.00	
<hr/>		
01/08/11	\$247.00	2011 Tax year benefits
01/15/11	247.00	
01/22/11	247.00	

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the claimant's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

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 claimant did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received in a timely fashion. 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 claimant filed the appeal within three days of receipt. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

The next issue is whether the claimant is overpaid benefits. The administrative law judge concludes she is.

Iowa Code § 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The administrative law judge concludes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview. Although claimant did not engage in any fraud or willful misrepresentation to obtain the benefits, she received benefits to which she was not entitled according to the administrative law judge's separation decision referenced above, which has become final unless the Employment Appeal Board (EAB) remands for a new hearing. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The May 18, 2012 (reference 04) representative's decision is affirmed. The claimant has received unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,470.00 to which she was not entitled and those benefits must be recovered in accordance with Iowa law.

Dévon M. Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css