IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

ANGELA WARNER

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-01078-JC-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

SHORT STAFFED INC

Employer

OC: 06/21/20

Claimant: Appellant (6)

lowa Code § 96.5(1) - Voluntary Quitting

lowa Code § 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

lowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the October 6, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. After proper notice, a telephone hearing was conducted on February 15, 2021. Claimant participated. Employer did not respond to the notice of hearing to furnish a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate in the hearing. Official notice was taken of the administrative records. Department Exhibit 1 (Appeal letter) was admitted.

ISSUE:

Is the appeal timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An initial unemployment insurance decision (Reference 01) resulting in a denial of benefits was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on October 6, 2020. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by October 16, 2020.

Between October 6 and October 16, 2020, claimant stated she was not checking the mail. Because claimant did not check her mail, she did not receive the initial decision within the prescribed period. Claimant thinks she may have received the decision around Halloween. Claimant filed the appeal on December 9, 2020, using the online option (Department Exhibit 1).

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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

Filing – determination – appeal.

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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

- (2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.
- a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.
- b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.
- c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.
- d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

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 (lowa 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 lowa Supreme 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (lowa 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 (lowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (lowa 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 (lowa 1974); Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (lowa 1973).

The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. Claimant's delay in filing her appeal was because she chose not to check her mail for an extended period of time. Claimant did not present extenuating circumstances which caused her to be unable to check her mail. Even if the administrative law judge considers a possible receipt date of Halloween when calculating claimant opening the mail and seeing the decision, her appeal was not filed until December 9, 2020.

Based on the evidence presented, 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 lowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to lowa 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 (lowa 1979) and Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 277 N.W.2d 877 (lowa 1979).

DECISION:

The October 6, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision denying benefits remains in effect as the appellant is in default.



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
lowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

March 1, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

ilb/scn

NOTE TO CLAIM ANT:

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.

If you do not qualify for regular unemployment insurance benefits due to disqualifying separations and are currently unemployed for reasons related to COVID-19, you may qualify for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA). You will need to apply for PUA to determine your eligibility under the program. More information about how to apply for PUA is available online at:

www.iowaworkforcedevelopment.gov/pua-information

You may find information about food, housing, and other resources at https://covidrecoveryiowa.org/ or at https://dhs.iowa.gov/node/3250

lowa Finance Authority also has additional resources at https://www.iowafinance.com/about/covid-19-ifa-recovery-assistance/