

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**CHRISTIAN E DE VERA**  
Claimant

**APPEAL 22R-UI-01598-JC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 03/28/21  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.4(4)a-c – Monetary Eligibility and Subsequent Benefit Year  
Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The claimant/appellant, Christian E. DeVera, filed an appeal from the April 13, 2021 (reference 02) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. A first hearing was scheduled for September 8, 2021. Claimant/appellant did not appear and the appeal was dismissed. Upon successful request to reopen the hearing record, the Employment Appeal Board remanded the matter for a new hearing.

After proper notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 9, 2022. The hearing was held as a consolidated hearing including Appeals 22R-UI-01596-JC-T, 22R-UI-01597-JC-T, and 22R-UI-01598-JC-T. The claimant participated.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records. 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. Department Exhibit D-1 was admitted.

**ISSUES:**

Is the appeal timely?

Did the claimant earn insured wages of at least eight times the prior claim year’s weekly benefit amount during or after the previous benefit year to become eligible for a second benefit year?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance for March 29, 2020. An initial decision (reference 10) denied benefits based upon his April 2020 separation with Lennox Industries Inc. Claimant did not perform work for any employer after his April 21, 2020 separation with this employer. Claimant filed a claim for a second benefit year effective March 28, 2021.

An initial decision (reference 02) denying benefits was mailed to claimant's address of record on April 13, 2021. The decision contained a warning that an appeal was due by April 23, 2021. Claimant did receive the initial decision within the appeal period.

The appeal was filed on July 14, 2021 (Department Exhibit D-1). The appeal was delayed because claimant was "just not into it anymore" and frustrated with the unemployment insurance benefits process. Claimant's delay in filing his appeal was not due to agency or postal service error.

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

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

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

Filing – determination – appeal.

The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. . . . Unless 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(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).

In this case, claimant stated he received the initial decision. He did not contact customer service as directed on the initial decision but visited his local IWD office after the due date. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes that claimant's failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was *not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service* pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the appeal. See, *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

**DECISION:**

The April 13, 2021, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect.



---

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

February 28, 2022

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/kmj