

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

CHRISTINA M GLOVER

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-10954-JT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CASEY'S MARKETING COMPANY

Employer

OC: 08/19/12

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.3(5) – Layoff Pursuant to Business Closing
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Christina Glover appealed from an unemployment insurance decision dated September 5, 2012, reference 01, that denied her request to have benefits redetermined as being based on a layoff due to a business closing. At Ms. Glover's request, an in-person was scheduled in Creston on November 13, 2012. Neither Ms. Glover nor the employer appeared for the hearing. Based on the claimant/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.

ISSUE:

Decision on the record.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal by notice mailed on November 5, 2012. The appellant, Christina Glover, failed to appear for the in-person hearing she had requested. That hearing was set for November 13, 2012 at 11:30 a.m. at the Creston Workforce Development Center. Ms. Glover did not request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. Ms. Glover was aware of the hearing and elected not to appear. Toward the end of the business day on November 13, 2012, the Creston Workforce Development staff reviewed their phone messages for the day and found a message from Ms. Glover from 10:29 a.m. on November 13, 2012. The message was not preserved and the administrative law judge did not get to hear the message. The Workforce Development Center staff reported to the administrative law judge that Ms. Glover indicated she was not going to appear for the hearing and thought the matter was resolved.

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 Agency representative's September 5, 2012, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The decision that denied the request to have benefits redetermined as being based on a business closing 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.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/kjw