

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

SHALLOM M KATA
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-08960-VST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 01/02/11
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.3-7 – Overpayment of Benefits
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from a decision of a representative dated June 21, 2011, reference 02, which held claimant had been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled for and held on September 11, 2012. The claimant participated personally. The record consists of the testimony of Shallom Kata. Official notice is taken of agency records. Agata Sisto served as interpreter for the claimant in the Lang Kunama language.

ISSUES:

Whether the claimant filed a timely appeal; and
Whether the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witnesses and having considered all of the evidence in the record, makes the following findings of fact:

On June 21, 2011, a representative issued a decision that held that the claimant was overpaid unemployment insurance benefits. The decision also states that the decision would become final unless an appeal was postmarked by July 1, 2011, or received by the Appeals Section on that date. The claimant's appeal was filed on July 25, 2012.

The claimant established an original claim for benefits with an original claim date of January 2, 2011. The representative denied the claimant benefits effective November 15, 2010, because the claimant was not available for work. The claimant has been disabled and unable to work. The representative's decision was appealed to an administrative law judge and affirmed in 11A-UI-02531-NT, which was filed on April 20, 2011. No further appeal was filed.

The claimant received unemployment insurance benefits for the six weeks ending February 2, 2011, in the amount of \$2,766.00.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The preliminary issue in this case is whether the claimant timely appealed the representative's decision. Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides that unless the affected party (here, the claimant) files an appeal from the decision within ten calendar days, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied as set out by the decision.

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. Board of Adjustment, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

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 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. IDJS, 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. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. Hendren v. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

In this case, the claimant has no recollection of receiving the decision dated June 21, 2011. The administrative law judge is mindful that the claimant has no ability to speak or read English and is dependent upon other members of his community to assist him. The appeal was likely filed after he received a statement from the agency. He did file an appeal after receiving a statement. Under the very unique circumstances in this case, the administrative law judge will consider the appeal timely filed.

The next issue is whether the claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7, as amended in 2008, provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

- a. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from

any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

b. (1) If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5. However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment. The employer shall not be charged with the benefits.

(2) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to section 602.10101.

The evidence in this case established that the claimant received benefits to which he was not entitled. These benefits must now be repaid. This is true even though the claimant is not presently employed and is unable to work. He is encouraged to contact the department to work out arrangements for repayment of the benefits.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated June 21, 2011, reference 02, is affirmed. The claimant has been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits in the amount of \$2,766.00. Those benefits must be repaid.

Vicki L. Seeck
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

vls/pjs