

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

**KEVIN P KING**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 19A-UI-01894-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**RANDSTAD US LLC**  
Employer

**OC: 01/27/19**  
**Claimant: Appellant (6)**

Iowa Code § 17A.12(3) – Default Decision  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.14(7) – Dismissal of Appeal on Default

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Kevin King filed a timely appeal from the February 22, 2019, reference 03, decision that held he was disqualified for benefits and the employer's account would not be charged for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that Mr. King was discharged on January 26, 2019 for misconduct in connection with the employment. A notice of hearing was mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record for a telephone hearing to be held at 9:00 a.m. on March 19, 2019. The employer registered a telephone number for the hearing and was available through Michal Schaben and Colby Corrigan. Mr. King registered a telephone number for the hearing, was available at the start of the hearing, but left the hearing prior to the presentation of evidence. Based upon the claimant/appellant's failure to participate in the hearing and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

**ISSUE:**

Should the appeal be dismissed based upon the claimant/appellant not participating in the hearing?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Claimant Kevin King is the appellant in this matter. Mr. King was properly notified of the appeal hearing set for 9:00 a.m. on March 19, 2019 through the hearing notice that was mailed to his last-known address of record on March 6, 2019. On March 18, 2019, Mr. King registered a telephone number whether he could be reached for the hearing. At the time of the hearing, the administrative law judge contacted Mr. King at the number he had registered for the hearing. During the opening statement portion of the hearing, Mr. King twice disconnected from the hearing. After the first disconnect, the administrative law judge was able to contact Mr. King at his registered number and reconnect him to the hearing. After the second disconnect, the administrative law judge made three attempts to reach Mr. King at his registered number, but Mr. King did not answer. On each attempt, the administrative law judge left an appropriate message. Mr. King did not respond to the voice mail messages. The administrative law judge had the employer stand by. The administrative law made the third and final attempt to reach

Mr. King at 9:30 a.m. and left the final voicemail message at 9:31 a.m. The administrative law judge then closed the hearing record and dismissed the employer from the hearing.

The February 22, 2019, reference 03, decision held that Mr. King was disqualified for benefits and the employer's account would not be charged for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that Mr. King was discharged on January 26, 2019 for misconduct in connection with the employment.

#### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The Iowa Administrative Procedures Act at Iowa Code § 17A.12(3) provides in pertinent part:

If a party fails to appear or participate in a contested case proceeding after proper service of notice, the presiding officer may, if no adjournment is granted, enter a default decision or proceed with the hearing and make a decision in the absence of the party. ... If a decision is rendered against a party who failed to appear for the hearing and the presiding officer is timely requested by that party to vacate the decision for good cause, the time for initiating a further appeal is stayed pending a determination by the presiding officer to grant or deny the request. If adequate reasons are provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall vacate the decision and, after proper service of notice, conduct another evidentiary hearing. If adequate reasons are not provided showing good cause for the party's failure to appear, the presiding officer shall deny the motion to vacate.

Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals bureau with the names and telephone numbers of the persons who are participating in the hearing by the scheduled starting time of the hearing or is not available at the telephone number provided, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing. If the appealing party fails to provide a telephone number or is unavailable for the hearing, the presiding officer may decide the appealing party is in default and dismiss the appeal as provide in Iowa Code section 17A.12(3). The record may be reopened if the absent party makes a request to reopen the hearing in writing under subrule 26.8(3) and shows good cause for reopening the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

Iowa Administrative Code rule 871-26.8(4) provides:

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision must be made in writing. If necessary, the presiding officer may hear, ex parte, additional information regarding the request for reopening. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as 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.

The claimant/appellant appealed the representative's decision but failed to participate in the hearing. The claimant/appellant has therefore defaulted on his appeal pursuant to Iowa Code §17A.12(3) and Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.14(7), and the representative's decision remains in force and effect.

If the claimant/appellant disagrees with this decision, pursuant to the rule, the claimant/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 end of this decision and must explain the good cause that prevented the claimant/appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

**DECISION:**

The February 22, 2019, reference 03, decision is affirmed. The decision that held the claimant was disqualified for benefits and the employer's account would not be charged for benefits, based on the deputy's conclusion that the claimant was discharged on January 26, 2019 for misconduct in connection with the employment, remains in effect.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau  
Iowa Workforce Development  
1000 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209  
Fax 515-478-3528

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/rvs