

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LISA M SCHLATTER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-05526-HT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

THOMAS L CARDELLA & ASSOCIATES
Employer

OC: 07/03/11
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Section 96.5(2)a – Discharge
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant, Lisa Schlatter, filed an appeal from a decision dated August 12, 2011, reference 01. The decision disqualified her from receiving unemployment benefits. After due notice was issued a hearing was held by telephone conference call on June 4, 2012. The claimant participated on her own behalf. The employer, Thomas L. Cardella and Associates (Cardella), participated by Cory Samuels, Natalie Humphreys, Cory Nehmers, and was represented by TALX in the person of Barb Toney. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into the record.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the appeal is timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

A disqualification decision was mailed to the claimant's last-known address of record on August 12, 2011. The claimant received the decision. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by August 22, 2011. The appeal was not filed until May 11, 2012, which is after the date noticed on the decision.

The claimant maintained part of the reason she did not file a timely appeal was that she was experiencing complications from her pregnancy, but she gave birth in October 2011, over six months before she filed the appeal.

In addition, she thought she needed to have all of her exhibits in order to file the appeal. At the same time she stated she thought the issue was “done” and no further action could be taken.

The appeal was filed when the claimant received the overpayment decision dated May 1, 2012.

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).

(1) The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The claimant's other arguments about why she was late filing are not convincing. Ms. Schlatter stated she did read the decision but somehow missed the part which said the decision *would* become final unless an appeal was filed by August 22, 2011, and the instruction on the back of the decision which clearly and concisely states what is required in order to file an appeal.

It is apparent Ms. Schlatter did nothing at all until she received the overpayment decision and was then prompted to attempt to re-adjudicate the separation issue. This is not good cause for a late appeal.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated August 12, 2011, reference 01, is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect. The claimant is disqualified for unemployment benefits.

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/pjs