

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

DARRYL Q ZEIGLER

Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-03488-JC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

OC: 06/23/19

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(13) – Disqualification due to Outstanding Fraud Overpayment

Iowa Code § 96.16(4) – Offenses and Misrepresentation

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant, Darryl Q. Zeigler, filed an appeal from the July 3, 2019 (reference 02) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision which concluded the claimant was ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits due to an outstanding fraud overpayment balance.

The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on May 18, 2020. The claimant participated personally. IWD Investigation and Recovery Unit elected to participate by writing only and IWD Exhibits 1-5 were admitted into evidence. Claimant Exhibit A (Appeal letter) was also admitted. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant’s unemployment insurance benefits records. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUES:

Did the claimant file a timely appeal?

Is the claimant ineligible for benefits due to an outstanding fraud overpayment balance?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits with an effective date of December 31, 2017. Thereafter, an investigatory audit was conducted regarding the claimant’s failure to report all wages while concurrently filed weekly continued claims for benefits. Consequently, a decision was issued on January 4, 2019 which found that the claimant was overpaid benefits of \$3,319.00, and added a 15% penalty due to fraud. (Department Exhibit 3) The decision is final at this time.

The claimant then established a claim with an effective date of June 23, 2019 and an additional claim effective April 20, 2020. Effective July 1, 2018, a claimant with an overpayment by reason of misrepresentation is disqualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits until the overpayment interest and associated fees and penalties are paid in full. Iowa Code section 96.5(13). To date, the claimant has failed to pay the outstanding overpayment amount owed, including interest, penalties, and lien fees. The current outstanding balance owed is \$3,821.80 (Department Exhibit 2).

An initial unemployment insurance decision (Reference 05) notifying the claimant of an outstanding balance due to fraud/misrepresentation was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on June 23, 2019. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by July 13, 2019. Because July 13, 2019 was a Saturday, the final day to appeal was extended to Monday, July 15, 2019.

The claimant filed his appeal on April 27, 2020 (Claimant Exhibit A). The claimant acknowledged receiving the initial decision, alerting him to the outstanding balance, but declined to appeal it, because he was only filing his claims for 2-3 weeks at that time and didn't think it was necessary. The claimant did not realize the decision would still impact him when he filed his additional claim with an effective date of April 20, 2020.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

Filing – determination – appeal.

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. . . . 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.

b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.

c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.

d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

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).

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 follow the clear written instructions 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).

Even if the claimant's appeal was deemed timely, he would still be ineligible for benefits due to an outstanding overpayment due to fraud.

Iowa Code section 96.16(4)(a) provides:

4. Misrepresentation.

- a. An individual who, by reason of the nondisclosure or misrepresentation by the individual or by another of a material fact, has received any sum as benefits under this chapter while any conditions for the receipt of benefits imposed by this chapter were not fulfilled in the individual's case, or while the individual was disqualified from receiving benefits, shall, be liable to repay to the department for the unemployment compensation fund, a sum equal to the amount so received by the individual. If the department seeks to recover the amount of the benefits by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to that amount, the department may file a lien with the county recorder in favor of the state on the individual's property and rights to property, whether real or personal. The amount of the lien shall be collected in a manner similar to the provisions for the collection of past-due contributions in section 96.14, subsection 3.

Iowa Workforce Development established an overpayment and imposed a penalty due to misrepresentation/fraud (Department Exhibit 3). The decision is final at this time. Therefore, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant has an established overpayment derived from fraud/misrepresentation

Iowa Code section 96.5(13) provides:

Overpayment resulting in disqualification. If the department finds that an individual has received benefits by reason of misrepresentation pursuant to section 96.16, such individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the balance of the benefits received by the individual due to misrepresentation, including all penalties, interest, and lien fees, is paid in full.

The administrative law judge recognizes the claimant has filed his current claim effective April 20, 2020, due to hardship related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant currently owes a balance of \$3,821.80 (Department Exhibit 2). The claimant owes any additional interest, penalties and lien fees. Because this unpaid fraud overpayment balance remains unpaid, the claimant is not eligible for benefits at this time.

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 are currently 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.** Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at <https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information>.

DECISION:

The July 3, 2019, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

May 22, 2020
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn