IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

EDCAR BEIO
Claimant

ADVANCE SERVICES INC
Employer

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-00428-BT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

Original Claim: 11/15/09
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5-3-a - Refusal of Suitable Work
871 IAC 26.8(5) - Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Edcar Beio (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated December 31, 2009, reference 07, which held that he was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits because he refused an offer of suitable work from Advance Services, Inc. (employer). A hearing was initially scheduled for February 18, 2010, but the hearing did not go forward because the claimant needed a Marshallese interpreter. The Appeals Section had some difficulty locating an interpreter but was able to secure an interpreter and the hearing was subsequently scheduled for March 23, 2010. The appellant was not available at his telephone number after it was dialed twice and, therefore, did not participate in the hearing. Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant was not available when called at the number provided and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the available documents in the administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

> Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

Pursuant to the rule, the appellant must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of this decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause that prevented the appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated December 31, 2009, reference 07, is affirmed. The decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits remains in effect. This decision will become final unless a written request establishing good cause to reopen the record is made to the administrative law judge within 15 days of the date of this decision.

_____
Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

_____
Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/kjw