IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

CATHERINE K MADCHARO Claimant	APPEAL 20A-UI-13014-CL-T ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION
IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT	
	OC: 05/24/20 Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal Iowa Code § 96.4(4)a-c – Monetary Eligibility and Subsequent Benefit Year

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the July 7, 2020, (reference 01), unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits in a second claim year. After due notice was issued, a telephone conference hearing was scheduled to be held on December 16, 2020. Claimant participated.

ISSUES:

Is the appeal timely? Is the claimant eligible for benefits in a second benefit year?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On July 7, 2020, lowa Workforce Development mailed the reference 01 unemployment insurance decision to claimant's last address of record. The decision warned that an appeal was due by July 17, 2020. Claimant received the decision within the appeal period. Claimant contacted Iowa Workforce Development and a customer service representative confirmed with claimant that she was receiving Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation and she would be allowed to receive 13 weeks of those benefits, regardless of the decision that denied regular unemployment insurance benefits in a second benefit year. Claimant was not seeking regular unemployment insurance benefits in a second benefit year. Therefore, claimant did not file an appeal.

On October 12, 2020, Iowa Workforce Development issued a reference 02 decision finding claimant overpaid unemployment insurance benefits due to the reference 01 decision that was issued in July 2020. On October 18, 2020, claimant filed an appeal.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code section 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. . . . Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with 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. Bd. of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

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 Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from unemployment insurance 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. The administrative law judge concludes that failure to follow the clear written instructions to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the lowa Employment Security Law *was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service* pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See, *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The July 7, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

"hAL

Christine A. Louis Administrative Law Judge Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau 1000 East Grand Avenue Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209 Fax (515)478-3528

December 29, 2020 Decision Dated and Mailed

cal/scn

Note to Claimant: This decision determines you are not eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits. If you disagree with this decision you may file an appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by following the instructions on the first page of this decision. Individuals who do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations, but who are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19 may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. Additional information on how to apply for PUA can be found at https://www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information.