

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

TRACEY SCHWASS
Claimant

**IOWA WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**
Employer

APPEAL 22A-UI-03924-JD-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 05/03/20
Claimant: Appellant (1R)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal
Public Law 116-136, Sec. 2107 – Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant filed an appeal from the January 18, 2022, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits based upon a determination that the claimant was overpaid PEUC benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on March 14, 2022. The claimant, Tracey Schwas, participated and testified. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Is the claimant's appeal timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A disqualifying unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the claimant's last known address of record on January 18, 2022. Claimant received the decision within the appeal period. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Bureau by January 28, 2022. The appeal was not filed until February 2, 2022, which is after the date noticed on the unemployment insurance decision. No evidence was presented that claimant's appeal was delayed due to Agency or US Postal Service error.

The claimant testified that she has never lived or work in California and is unclear why there would be wages reported under her social security number from that State. After careful review of the claimant's administrative file it is unclear to the Administrative Law Judge how, when or where this determination was made.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge concludes the claimant's appeal is untimely.

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) provides, in pertinent part:

“[u]nless 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.”

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

1. Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

(a) If transmitted via the United States Postal Service 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 is 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.

(b) If transmitted via the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.

(c) If transmitted by any means other than [United States Postal Service or the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES)], on the date it is received by the division.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

2. The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

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).


Here, the claimant received the decision in the mail and, therefore, had an opportunity to file an appeal prior to the appeal deadline. Claimant's delay was not due to an error or misinformation from the Department or due to delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. No other good cause reason has been established for the delay. Claimant's appeal was not filed on time and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction (authority) to decide the other issue in this matter.

DECISION:

The January 18, 2022, (reference 03) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

REMAND:

The underlying issue of whether the claimant has qualified wages from the State of California that make her monetarily ineligible for benefits in Iowa is remanded to both the Benefits Bureau and Investigations and Recovery bureaus of IWD for further investigation and determination.



Jason Dunn
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515) 478-3528

March 28, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

jd/mh