

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DIANA SISK

Claimant

APPEAL NO: 14A-UI-06492-ST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ABCM CORPORATION

Employer

OC: 05/18/14

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant appealed a department decision dated June 4, 2014, reference 01, that held she was discharged for misconduct on May 16, 2014, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on July 16, 2014. The claimant participated. Tiffany Adams, HR representative and Jean Creighton, Supervisor, participated for the employer. Claimant Exhibit A was received as evidence.

ISSUE:

Whether the claimant filed a timely appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge having heard the witness testimony and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The department mailed the decision to claimant's address of record on June 4, 2014 with an appeal deadline date of June 14 (Saturday) that is extended to June 16 (Monday). The claimant submitted an appeal postmarked on June 21, 2014 from Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Claimant knew the appeal deadline and she offered no good cause for the delay.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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.

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).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

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. IDJS*, 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. IDJS*, 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. IESC*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 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 the claimant failed to file a timely appeal.

The claimant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a more timely appeal by noting the deadline date and reading the appeal instructions. The claimant offered no good cause for the appeal delay.

DECISION:

The department decision dated June 4, 201, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant failed to file a timely appeal, and the department decision was discharged for misconduct on May 16, 2014 remains in force and effect. Benefits are denied until the claimant requalifies by working in and being paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/css