

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

MARGARET COCKHREN

Claimant,

and

ABCM CORPORATION

Employer.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 13B-UI-12693

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

N O T I C E

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: 96.5-2A, 96.3-7

D E C I S I O N

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS ARE DENIED

The Claimant appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board, one member dissenting, 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**.

Monique F. Kuester

Cloyd (Robby) Robinson

DISSENTING OPINION OF JOHN A. PENO:

I respectfully dissent from the decision of the Employment Appeal Board; I would reverse the decision of the administrative law judge in its entirety. I would find the Employer's appeal to be untimely, as it came one day after the statutory deadline. The Employer became aware of the fax error the same day the appeal was faxed and was obligated to either re-fax or mail the appeal so as to ensure its timeliness. The Employer's late appeal cannot be attributed to agency or postal error as accepted by the statute. For this reason, I would conclude the appeal is untimely and benefits should be allowed provided the Claimant is otherwise eligible.

John A. Peno

A portion of the Claimant's appeal to the Employment Appeal Board consisted of additional evidence which was not contained in the administrative file and which was not submitted to the administrative law judge. While the appeal and additional evidence were reviewed, the Employment Appeal Board, in its discretion, finds that the admission of the additional evidence is not warranted in reaching today's decision.

John A. Peno

Monique F. Kuester

Cloyd (Robby) Robinson

AMG/fnv