

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

BRIAN SCHMITT
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 130-UI-06134-ET

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

REBITRZERS BAR & GRILL LLC
Employer

OC: 01/06/13
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer/appellant filed a timely appeal from the February 21, 2013, reference 03, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant. After the appellant requested a postponement the hearing was scheduled March 27, 2013. The appellant did not respond to the hearing notice and no hearing was held in this matter. The appellant appealed to the Employment Appeal Board and stated he did not receive the second notice of hearing, noting the new hearing date as March 27, 2013. The Employment Appeal Board did not vacate the previous decision but did remand the case to the Appeals Section for a new hearing in an order dated May 20, 2013.

After due notice was issued, a hearing was scheduled by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on July 1, 2013. The appellant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice prior to the time the record was closed at 11:40 a.m. The appellant called at 11:45 a.m., the time the claimant had been told he no longer had to be available, but the caller could not provide a control number. He checked with his kitchen manager to see if he called in the appellant's phone number and then called the Appeals Section back and stated the kitchen manager had not called in but the appellant wanted to reschedule the hearing. If he had called and received a control number he would have been instructed at that time that if he had not heard from the administrative law judge by 11:35 a.m. he should call the Appeals Section immediately. The appellant did not follow the instructions on the Appeal Notice to call immediately upon receipt of the notice to provide his phone number and did not provide his phone number at any time prior to the hearing or the time the record was closed. The appellant has not provided a good cause reason for reopening the record and rescheduling the hearing.

Based on the appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the available evidence in the administrative file and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the representative's decision should be affirmed.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having considered all of the available evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the available administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a 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.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

Pursuant to the rule, the appellant must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause that prevented the appellant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated February 21, 2013, reference 03, is affirmed. The representative's decision allowing benefits to the claimant remains in effect. This decision will become final unless a written request establishing good cause to reopen the record is made to the administrative law judge within 15 days of the date of this decision.

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/pjs