

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

EUGENE NZAU-TSASA

Claimant

APPEAL 21A-UI-16573-JC-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

STAFF MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS LLC

Employer

OC: 04/19/20

Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The claimant/appellant filed an appeal from the November 16, 2020 (reference 04) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on September 29, 2021. The hearing was held together with Appeal 21A-UI-16571-JC-T and 21A-UI-16572-JC-T. The claimant participated personally. The employer did not respond to the notice of hearing to furnish a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate in the hearing.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. Claimant Exhibits A-B and Department Exhibit 1 were received. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Is the appeal timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: An initial decision (reference 04) was mailed to the claimant/appellant’s address of record on November 16, 2020. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be filed by November 26, 2020. Claimant did receive the initial decision but did not appeal it immediately. There is no evidence claimant’s delay in filing the appeal was due to agency or postal service error. Claimant filed his appeal on July 28, 2021 after receiving an initial decision regarding an overpayment of FPUC benefits. See Department Exhibit 1.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to address is whether the appeal is timely.

Iowa law states that an unemployment insurance decision is final unless a party appeals the decision within ten days after the decision was mailed to the party's last known address. See Iowa Code § 96.6(2).

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

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(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.

a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.

b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.

c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.

d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. *Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); *Johnson v. Board of Adjustment*, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also *In re Appeal of Elliott*, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. *Hendren v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Emp't Sec. Comm'n*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973).

DECISION:

The November 16, 2020 (reference 04) Iowa Workforce Development ("IWD") decision is affirmed. The claimant did not file a timely appeal. Therefore, his appeal is dismissed.



Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax 515-478-3528

October 13, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/mh