

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building
Fourth floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319**

MARK SCHUSTER

Claimant

and

DULUTH HOLDINGS INC

Employer

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

HEARING NUMBER: 20B-UI-09113

**EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
DECISION**

SECTION: 10A.601 Employment Appeal Board Review

D E C I S I O N

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The notice of hearing in this matter was mailed August 31, 2020. The notice set a hearing for September 17, 2020. The Claimant did not appear for or participate in the hearing. Prior to the hearing the Claimant called Iowa Workforce to confirm the date and time of hearing. The Claimant called into Iowa Workforce shortly after the starting time of hearing, but was put on hold for 25 minutes. He was then told it was too late to participate in the hearing.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 10A.601(4) (2019) provides:

4. Appeal board review. The appeal board may on its own motion affirm, modify, or set aside any decision of an administrative law judge on the basis of the evidence previously submitted in such case, or direct the taking of additional evidence, or may permit any of the parties to such decision to initiate further appeals before it. The appeal board shall permit such further appeal by any of the parties interested in a decision of an administrative law judge and by the representative whose decision has been overruled or modified by the administrative law judge. The appeal board shall review the case pursuant to rules adopted by the appeal board. The appeal board shall promptly notify the interested parties of its findings and decision.

Here the Claimant did not participate in the hearing because the Claimant had not provided a telephone number for the administrative law judge to call. When the Claimant did not receive a call, the Claimant in due diligence attempted to contacted the administrative law judge within a reasonable timeframe after the scheduled hearing time. This established the Claimant's intention to follow through with the appeals process. For this reason, the matter will be remanded for another hearing before an administrative law judge so that the Claimant may participate in the hearing.

DECISION:

The decision of the administrative law judge dated September 18, 2020 is not vacated and remains in force unless and until the Department makes a differing determination pursuant to this remand. This matter is remanded to an administrative law judge in the Workforce Development Center, Appeals Bureau. The administrative law judge shall conduct a hearing following due notice. After the hearing, the administrative law judge shall issue a decision which provides the parties appeal rights.

Ashley R. Koopmans

James M. Strohman

Myron R. Linn

RRA/fnv