

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

NICHOLAS WATSON
Claimant

ACRO MANUFACTURING CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 21A-UI-18215-JC-T
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 01/03/21
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.4(3) – Able to and Available for Work
Iowa Code § 96.19(38)a & b – Total and Partial Unemployment
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.23(26) – Able & Available – Availability Disqualifications
Iowa Code § 96.7(2)a(2) – Same Base Period Employment
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant, Nicholas Watson, filed an appeal from the February 10, 2021 (reference 02) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on October 12, 2021. The claimant participated personally. The employer, Acro Manufacturing Corporation, participated through David Robinson, plant manager.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. Department Exhibit 1 was admitted. 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:

Is the appeal timely?
Is the claimant totally, partially, or temporarily unemployed effective January 3, 2021?
Is the claimant able to and available for work?
Is the claimant still employed at the same hours and wages?
Is the employer’s account subject to charge?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant has worked a full-time maintenance assistant since September 24, 2019. He earns \$21.00 per hour and works 40 hours per week. Claimant was laid off work for the period between Christmas day and New Year’s day. He was not paid by the employer for the time off. Claimant established his claim with an effective date of January 3, 2021. He returned to full-time work effective January 3, 2021.

An initial decision (reference 02) was mailed to the claimant/appellant's address of record on February 10, 2021. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be filed by February 20, 2021. Because February 20, 2021 was a Saturday, the appeal deadline was extended to February 22, 2021. Claimant received the initial decision within the appeal period. Appellant filed the appeal on August 17, 2021 (See Department Exhibit 1). The appeal was delayed because claimant was gathering documents to use in support of his other appeal for the reference 01 decision. There was no evidence presented that claimant's appeal was delayed due to agency or postal service error.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to address is whether claimant filed a timely appeal.

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).

DECISION:

The reference 02 initial decision dated at February 10, 2021 is affirmed. The appeal was untimely and therefore the appeal is dismissed.



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

October 15, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/kmj