

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**FRANK C FAUST**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-09323-LT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IA DEPT OF HUMAN SVCS/GLENWOOD**  
Employer

**OC: 07/14/13**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting  
Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

An appeal was filed from an unemployment insurance decision dated August 2, 2013, (reference 01) that found the claimant voluntarily left the employment without good cause attributable to the employer, but was discharged for no disqualifying reason prior to the intended resignation date benefits. A telephone hearing was scheduled for September 18, 2013. The respondent did not respond to the hearing notice instructions. The appellant responded to the hearing notice instructions but was not available when the hearing was called, did not provide an alternate contact number, and did not participate in the hearing. The appellant called at 2:11 p.m. after the hearing record was closed at 2:10 p.m. He was not available when the hearing was called because he was in an area without cell phone reception. Based on the appellant's failure to participate, 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 record be reopened and should the representative's decision be affirmed?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The appellant failed to provide a telephone number at which he could be reached for the hearing and did not participate or request a postponement of the hearing as required by the hearing notice.

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

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The first issue in this case is whether the appellant's request to reopen the hearing should be granted or denied.

871 IAC 26.14(7) provides:

(7) If a party has not responded to a notice of telephone hearing by providing the appeals section with the names and telephone numbers of its witnesses by the scheduled time of the hearing, the presiding officer may proceed with the hearing.

a. If an absent party responds to the hearing notice while the hearing is in progress, the presiding officer shall pause to admit the party, summarize the hearing to that point, administer the oath, and resume the hearing.

b. If a party responds to the notice of hearing after the record has been closed and any party which has participated is no longer on the telephone line, the presiding officer shall not take the evidence of the late party. Instead, the presiding officer shall inquire as to why the party was late in responding to the notice of hearing. For good cause shown, the presiding officer shall reopen the record and cause further notice of hearing to be issued to all parties of record. The record shall not be reopened if the presiding officer does not find good cause for the party's late response to the notice of hearing.

c. Failure to read or follow the instructions on the notice of hearing shall not constitute good cause for reopening the record.

Although the appellant may have intended to participate in the hearing, the appellant failed to be available for the hearing as scheduled and did not request a postponement prior to the hearing. The appellant's failure to provide a number where he could be reached for the hearing (because of poor cell phone reception) is not good cause to reopen the hearing. Therefore, the appellant's request to reopen the hearing is denied.

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 available evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 2, 2013, (reference 01) is affirmed. The representative's decision remains in effect.

---

Dévon M. Lewis  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/css