

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**MICHAEL L MILLER**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-00558-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CARGILL MEAT SOLUTIONS CORP**  
Employer

**OC: 12/15/13**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) – Discharge for Misconduct  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer appealed from an unemployment insurance decision dated January 7, 2014, reference 01, that allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for February 6, 2014. The employer/appellant provided a telephone number at which a representative could be reached for the hearing, but the employer representative was not available at that number at the scheduled time of the hearing. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice instructions to provide a telephone number for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing. Based on the employer/appellant's failure to participate in the hearing, the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

The claimant contacted the Appeals Section more than three hours after the scheduled start of the hearing, but did not provide good cause to reopen the hearing record.

**ISSUE:**

Whether Mr. Miller was discharged for misconduct in connection with the employment that disqualifies him for unemployment insurance benefits.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. On February 4, 2014, the appellant, Cargill Meat Solutions Corporation, responded to the hearing notice instructions and provided a telephone number at which a representative could be reached for the hearing: Angie Stevens at 641-683-4836. However, at the scheduled time of the hearing, the employer was not available at the telephone number the employer provided. The appellant did not request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. The administrative law judge made two attempts to reach Ms. Stevens at the number the employer had provided for the hearing. On both instances, Ms. Stevens did not answer. However, the answering system identified the number as belonging to Ms. Stevens. The administrative law judge left an appropriate message for Ms. Stevens on each attempt to reach her for the hearing.

Ms. Stevens did not respond to those messages or otherwise make herself available for the hearing.

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the 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.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

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 this 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 Agency representatives January 7, 2014, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The decision that allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits 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.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/css