

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

WILLIE HEIDELBERG
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-11560-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

STAFFING PROFESSIONALS LLC
Employer

**Original Claim: 06/14/09
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code section 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit
Iowa Code section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Willie Heidelberg filed an appeal from the July 30, 2009, reference 06, decision that denied benefits in connection with an April 4, 2009 separation. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on September 3, 2009. Mr. Heidelberg participated. Amy Potratz, Human Resources Manager, represented the employer. Department Exhibits D-1, D-2, and D-3 were received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the July 23, 2009, reference 04, decision concerning the claimant and employer USA Staffing, Inc., and the fact-finding materials upon which the decision was based. The administrative law judge took official notice of the August 11, 2009, reference 05, decision concerning the claimant and employer Remedy Intelligent Staffing, Inc., and the fact-finding materials upon which the decision was based.

ISSUE:

Whether there is good cause to deem Mr. Heidelberg's late appeal from the July 30, 2009, reference 06 decision timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On July 30, 2009, Workforce Development mailed a copy of the reference 06 decision to Willie Heidelberg's last known address of record. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by August 9, 2009. Mr. Heidelberg received the decision in a timely manner, prior to the deadline for appeal. The decision also indicated that if the appeal deadline fell on a Sunday, the deadline would be extended to the next working day. August 9, 2009, was a Sunday, and the next working day was August 10, 2009. On August 12, 2009, Mr. Heidelberg went to his local Workforce Development Center, completed two appeal forms, and delivered the completed forms to the Workforce Development Center staff. One form referred to employer DES Staffing and concerned the July 30, 2009, reference 06 disqualification decision. That is the employer and decision at issue in this appeal. The other form referred to a different employer, USA Staffing, and concerned a reference 04

disqualification decision entered earlier, on July 23, 2009, with an August 2, 2009 appeal deadline. The Appeals Section received the appeal forms on August 13, 2009.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. 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. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". 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. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten-day deadline for appeal begins to run on the date Workforce Development mails the decision to the parties. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the Agency 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).

An appeal submitted by mail is deemed filed on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it was received, or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion. See 871 AC 24.35(1)(a). See also Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). See also Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Cedar Rapids v. Employment Appeal Board, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990). An appeal submitted by any other means is deemed filed on the date it is received by the Unemployment Insurance Division of Iowa Workforce Development. See 871 IAC 24.35(1)(b).

The appeal at issue in this matter was filed on August 12, 2009, when Mr. Heidelberg delivered his completed appeal form to the Cedar Rapids Workforce Development Center staff.

The evidence in the record establishes that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date of the July 30, 2009, reference 06 decision and the date Mr. Heidelberg filed his appeal from that decision. 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.

Mr. Heidelberg testified that he was in contact with the Cedar Rapids Workforce Development Center upon receipt of an initial decision that denied benefits and that a Workforce Development representative told him to wait to file an appeal from that decision until he participated in a second fact-finding interview concerning a separation from a different employer. The administrative finds not credible Mr. Heidelberg's assertion that an Agency representative would counsel him to delay appealing a decision regarding his separation from one employer until he received a subsequent decision concerning an unrelated separation from a different employer. In any event, both of the appeals Mr. Heidelberg filed were filed after the deadline for appeal had passed.

The administrative law judge concludes that the failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. See 871 IAC 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code section 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. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

DECISION:

The Agency representative's July 30, 2009, reference 06, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/kjw