

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

THOMAS J KREKEL
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 16A-UI-12102-DGT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 10/23/16
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.2(1)h(1) & (2) – Backdating

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated November 4, 2016, reference 01, which denied claimant's request to backdate a claim. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on November 29, 2016. Claimant participated personally.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the claim should be backdated.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds: Claimant filed a claim for benefits with an effective date of October 23, 2016. Claimant asserts that the claim should be backdated because he thought he would be able to obtain other employment, but the employment was never offered to him.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's request to backdate his claim is denied.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.2(1)h(1) and (2) provide:

Procedures for workers desiring to file a claim for benefits for unemployment insurance.

(1) Section 96.6 of the employment security law of Iowa states that claims for benefits shall be made in accordance with such rules as the department prescribes. The department of workforce development accordingly prescribes:

h. Effective starting date for the benefit year.

(1) Filing for benefits shall be effective as of Sunday of the current calendar week in which, subsequent to the individual's separation from work, an individual reports in person at a workforce development center and registers for work in accordance with paragraph "a" of this rule.

(2) The claim may be backdated prior to the first day of the calendar week in which the claimant does report and file a claim for the following reasons:

Backdated prior to the week in which the individual reported if the individual presents to the department sufficient grounds to justify or excuse the delay;

There is scheduled filing in the following week because of a mass layoff;

The failure of the department to recognize the expiration of the claimant's previous benefit year;

The individual is given incorrect advice by a workforce development employee;

The claimant filed an interstate claim against another state which has been determined as ineligible;

Failure on the part of the employer to comply with the provisions of the law or of these rules;

Coercion or intimidation exercised by the employer to prevent the prompt filing of such claim;

Failure of the department to discharge its responsibilities promptly in connection with such claim, the department shall extend the period during which such claim may be filed to a date which shall be not less than one week after the individual has received appropriate notice of potential rights to benefits, provided, that no such claim may be filed after the 13 weeks subsequent to the end of the benefit year during which the week of unemployment occurred. In the event continuous jurisdiction is exercised under the provisions of the law, the department may, in its discretion, extend the period during which claims, with respect to week of unemployment affected by such redetermination, may be filed.

Claimant's misunderstanding and honest mistake about when to file his claim are not considered good cause reasons for having failed to file a claim during the initial period of unemployment. Backdating is denied.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated November 4, 2016, reference 01, is affirmed. Claimant's request to backdate the claim is denied.

Duane L. Golden
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlg/pjs