

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JEFFREY A CARSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-03377-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

STAFFING PROFESSIONALS LLC
Employer

OC: 012/24/10
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.4(3) – Able & Available
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Jeffrey Carson appealed from an unemployment insurance decision dated February 26, 2010, reference 01, that denied benefits for the period of December 23, 2009 through February 25, 2010, based on a Agency conclusion that he was not available for work during that period. A telephone hearing was scheduled for April 20, 2010. Mr. Carson did not provide a telephone number for the hearing in response to the hearing notice instructions. The employer was eventually available for the hearing through Stacy Navarro. Based on the 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.

ISSUE:

Decision on the record.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Claimant Jeffrey Carson is the appellant in this matter. The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal by notice mailed on March 15, 2010. The notice directed to the claimant was returned to the Appeals Section on March 22, 2010 as undeliverable as addressed. On March 24, 2010, the Appeals Section staff contacted Mr. Carson and Mr. Carson confirmed the address was correct. Mr. Carson asked that the notice be remailed to him at the same address. Mr. Carson told the Appeals Section staff that he did not wish to give a telephone number for the hearing at that time because he might withdraw his appeal. The notice was remailed to the claimant at the same address. Mr. Caron failed to provide a telephone number at which he could be reached for the hearing and did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice. There is no evidence the remailed hearing notice was returned by the postal service as undeliverable for any reason.

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 representative's February 26, 2010, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The decision that denied benefits for the period of December 23, 2009 through February 25, 2010, based on an Agency conclusion that the claimant was not available for work during that period 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