BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD

Lucas State Office Building Fourth floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319

ALYSSA R FLINT

: **HEARING NUMBER:** 19BUI-04994

Claimant

and : **EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD**

: DECISION

MERCY MEDICAL CENTER

Employer :

NOTICE

THIS DECISION BECOMES FINAL unless (1) a **request for a REHEARING** is filed with the Employment Appeal Board within **20 days** of the date of the Board's decision or, (2) a **PETITION TO DISTRICT COURT** IS FILED WITHIN **30 days** of the date of the Board's decision.

A REHEARING REQUEST shall state the specific grounds and relief sought. If the rehearing request is denied, a petition may be filed in **DISTRICT COURT** within **30 days** of the date of the denial.

SECTION: 17A.12-3, 26.14-7

DECISION

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The issue of timeliness was raised on appeal when the Claimant filed his appeal beyond the deadline. The Board finds good cause for the untimely appeal, and considers it as timely.

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds the administrative law judge's decision is correct. The administrative law judge's Findings of Fact and Reasoning and Conclusions of Law are adopted by the Board as its own. The administrative law judge's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Claimant submitted additional evidence to the Board which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the additional evidence was reviewed for the purposes of determining whether admission of the evidence was warranted despite it not being presented at hearing, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision. There is no sufficient cause why the new and additional information submitted by Claimant was not presented at hearing. Accordingly none of the new and additional information submitted has been relied upon in making our decision, and none of it has received any weight whatsoever, but rather all of it has been wholly disregarded.

	Kim D. Schmett
	Ashley Koopmans
	_ James M. Strohman
RRA/ss DATED AND MAILED:	