

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

ROBERT SHERWOOD
Claimant

APPEAL 19A-UI-00099-DB-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

BROKER DEALER FINANCIAL SVS CORP
Employer

**OC: 12/09/18
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal
Iowa Code § 96.3(5) – Benefit Duration - Business Closing

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the December 19, 2018 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied the request to redetermine the claim based upon a business closure. After due notice was issued, a telephone hearing was held on January 22, 2019. Claimant participated personally. Employer did not participate. The administrative law judge took official notice of the claimant's unemployment insurance benefits records, including the fact-finding documents.

ISSUE:

Did the claimant file a timely appeal?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having heard the testimony and having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds:

A decision was issued on December 19, 2018 (reference 01) that found claimant's request to have his claim re-determined as a business closing was denied. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by December 29, 2018. The appeal was filed on January 4, 2019 via the online appeal system. Claimant did not file an appeal before the deadline because he was out of town from December 20, 2018 through January 3, 2019 and did not retrieve his mail from his mailbox until January 3, 2019.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. 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. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of § 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to § 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving § 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to § 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving § 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding § 96.8, subsection 5.

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).

There was no credible evidence presented that the failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was 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 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).

As such, the claimant has failed to file a timely appeal. The decision of the representative shall remain in effect.

DECISION:

The December 19, 2018 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

Dawn Boucher
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

db/rvs