

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**DIAMOND L LOVE**

Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 14A-UI-06232-ST**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**TYSON FRESH MEATS INC**

Employer

**OC: 02/23/14**

**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge  
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant appealed a department decision dated March 12, 2014, reference 01, that held she was discharged for misconduct on February 11, 2014, and benefits are denied. A telephone hearing was held on July 10, 2014. The claimant did not participate. Kristi Fox, HR Clerk, participated for the employer. Claimant Exhibit A was received as evidence.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant filed a timely appeal.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge having considered the evidence in the record finds: The department mailed the decision to claimant's address of record on March 12, 2014 with an appeal deadline date of March 22 (Saturday) that is extended to March 24 (Monday). The claimant signed and submitted an appeal to her local workforce center on June 16, 2014 that it faxed to UI Appeals on the same day.

Claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice. There is no record on UI Appeals C2T system claimant called in to provide a telephone to be contacted for the hearing.

The employer representative was available to participate but no hearing was held due to the late appeal and lack of claimant participation.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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. Board of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. IDJS*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

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 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. IDJS*, 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. IDJS*, 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. IESC*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. IESC*, 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 the claimant failed to file a timely appeal.

The claimant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a more timely appeal by noting the deadline date and reading the appeal instructions. The claimant offered no good cause for the appeal delay.

#### **DECISION:**

The department decision dated March 12, 2014 reference 01 is affirmed. The claimant failed to file a timely appeal, and the department decision she was discharged for misconduct on February 11, 2014 remains in force and effect. Benefits are denied until the claimant requalifies by working in and being paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Randy L. Stephenson  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/css