IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

MELVA ACOSTA CASTRO
Claimant

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-13675-VST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

OC: 11/10/13
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated December 11, 2013, (reference 01), which held that the claimant was ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for January 7, 2014. The claimant, who is the appellant, did not respond to the hearing notice. A copy of the Clear2there hearing control sheet is enclosed with the file, which shows that the claimant did not call in. The administrative law judge waited for ten minutes prior to closing the record. The claimant did not call in. The employer was available at all times and consented to a decision on the record. Also present and available for the hearing was Ike Rocha, who was to serve as the claimant's Spanish interpreter. Based on the appellant's failure to participate, a review of the administrative file, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law and decision.

ISSUE:

Should the representative's decision be affirmed?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the available evidence in the administrative record, the administrative law judge finds: The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The claimant failed, prior to the hearing date and time, to provide a telephone number at which she could be reached for the hearing and did not participate or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice instructions.

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

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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

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 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 unemployment insurance decision dated December 11, 2013, (reference 01) is affirmed. The representative's decision remains in effect.

_____
Vicki L. Seeck
Administrative Law Judge

_____
Decision Dated and Mailed

vls/css