

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**REYNALDO LOPEZ**  
Claimant

**APPEAL 19A-UI-09354-SC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 06/30/19**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal  
Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Able and Available/Work Search

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

On November 26, 2019, Reynaldo Lopez (claimant) filed an appeal from the September 18, 2019, reference 06, unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits for the week ending August 24, 2019 because he failed to make an active search for work after having been warned. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was held on December 20, 2019 and consolidated with the hearings for appeals 19A-UI-09352-SC-T, 19A-UI-09353-SC-T, 19A-UI-09355-SC-T, 19A-UI-09356-SC-T, 19A-UI-09357-SC-T, and 19A-UI-09358-SC-T. The claimant participated personally. Mark Muhs participated on the claimant's behalf. The claimant's Exhibits A and B and the department's Exhibits D1 through D8 were admitted into the record.

**ISSUE:**

Is the claimant's appeal timely?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on September 18, 2019. He receives his mail from Des Moines, Iowa in approximately two to three business days. The claimant's wife collected the mail from the mailbox and told him there was a letter from Iowa Workforce Development (IWD). The letter was put with other mail on the claimant's desk and he did not open it. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by September 28, 2019. The appeal was not filed until November 26, 2019, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision, because that was when the claimant collected the mail and opened the letter containing an overpayment statement of amount due from IWD.

## 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. Bd. 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 claimant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The claimant filed the appeal after the deadline because he did not open the letter from IWD. He has not established that the failure to file a timely appeal was due to any error or misinformation from IWD or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). As the appeal was not timely filed, 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).

**DECISION:**

The September 18, 2019, reference 06, unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.



---

Stephanie R. Callahan  
Administrative Law Judge

December 26, 2019  
Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn