

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JOSH P LAMB

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-06033-JTT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ACCESS DIRECT TELEMARKETING INC

Employer

**OC: 05/27/07 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

871 IAC 26.8(5) - Decision on the Record

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Access Direct Telemarketing appealed from an unemployment insurance decision dated June 12, 2007, reference 01, that allowed benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for July 3, 2007. Jackie Wiegand of TALX UC eXpress appeared on behalf of the employer. However, Ms. Wiegand's only witness, Rebecca Schwartzenegger, was not available at the number the employer had provided for the hearing. Ms. Wiegand acknowledged that she did not have any evidence to present, absent Ms. Schwartzenegger's testimony. Claimant Josh Lamb was available for the hearing and had two additional witnesses standing by. 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:

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The employer's representative of record is Johnson & Associates/TALX UC eXpress. Jackie Wiegand of TALX responded to the hearing notice instructions to provide a telephone number for the hearing. Ms. Wiegand provided a number for herself and for employer witness, Rebecca Schwartzenegger at 319-261-0265. Ms. Wiegand appeared for the hearing. However, at the scheduled start of the hearing, Ms. Schwartzenegger was not available at the designated number. Ms. Wiegand acknowledged that she did not have any evidence to present, absent Ms. Schwartzenegger's testimony. Claimant Josh Lamb was available for the hearing and had two additional witnesses standing by. In addition to leaving an appropriate voice mail message for Ms. Schwartzenegger, the administrative law judge provided Ms. Wiegand additional time to produce Ms. Schwartzenegger or another employer witness. Ms. Wiegand could not produce a witness for the hearing.

The appellant did not request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

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 June 12, 2007, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The decision allowing 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/pjs