

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**TAMAR D WOODS**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-05485-HT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**FAMILY DOLLAR STORES OF IOWA INC**  
Employer

**OC: 05/11/08 R: 02  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5(1) – Quit  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer, Family Dollar, filed an appeal from a decision dated June 3, 2008, reference 01. The decision allowed benefits to the claimant, Tamar Woods. After due notice was issued, a hearing was scheduled to be held by telephone conference call on July 14, 2008.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant quit work with good cause attributable to the employer.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. 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.

A telephone hearing in this matter was originally scheduled for June 25, 2008. The appellant did not participate in the hearing because the administrative law judge could not get through to his cell phone on the conferencing system, in addition to which he was in an area in which he did not have reception. The claimant could also not be reached due to technical problems with her phone.

The hearing was rescheduled to July 14, 2008, because of the technical problems. The appellant did call in later on June 25, 2008, at which time he was advised not to use a cell phone, or to make sure he was in an area where he got reception, for the rescheduled hearing. At the time of the rescheduled hearing, the appellant was still using his cell phone. That number was dialed at 9:00 a.m. and the only response was a voice mail. A message was left indicating the hearing would proceed without the appellant's participation unless he contacted the Appeals Section at the toll-free number prior to the close of the record. By the time the record was closed at 9:11 a.m., the appellant had not responded to the message 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 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 June 3, 2008, reference 01, is affirmed. The decision holding the claimant qualified for 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.

---

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/kjw