

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**BRIAN POPPEN**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 12A-UI-15180-BT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**IOWA WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**OC: 11/25/12**  
**Claimant: Appellant (1)**

871 IAC 24.2(1)a & h(1) & (2) - Backdating

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Brian Poppen (claimant) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated December 24, 2012, reference 01, which denied his request to backdate his claim prior to November 25, 2012. After a hearing notice was mailed to the party's last-known address of record, a telephone hearing was held on January 29, 2013. The claimant participated in the hearing with Plant Manager Mitch Kirkland. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant's unemployment insurance claim should be backdated.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant filed a claim for benefits with an effective date of November 25, 2012. He worked through November 8, 2012 and took off on November 9, 2012 due to his son having surgery in Minnesota. The claimant did not return to Iowa until shortly before Christmas.

The employer allowed the claimant to take time off work as business was slow. The claimant applied for short-term disability and was approved to take the time off but no benefits were payable since it was not his own medical condition.

Once the plant manager became aware that the claimant was not receiving any income, the manager was willing to indicate that the claimant was laid off from work so he could claim unemployment insurance benefits. The claimant now requests to backdate his claim to cover the additional weeks he did not receive any income.

## REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue to be determined is whether the claimant's request to backdate his claim should be granted. For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant's request to backdate his claim is denied.

871 IAC 24.2(1)h(1), (2) and (3) provide:

Procedures for workers desiring to file a claim for benefits for unemployment insurance.

(1) Section 96.6 of the employment security law of Iowa states that claims for benefits shall be made in accordance with such rules as the department prescribes. The department of workforce development accordingly prescribes:

h. Effective starting date for the benefit year.

(1) Filing for benefits shall be effective as of Sunday of the current calendar week in which, subsequent to the individual's separation from work, an individual reports in person at a workforce development center and registers for work in accordance with paragraph "a" of this rule.

(2) The claim may be backdated prior to the first day of the calendar week in which the claimant does report and file a claim for the following reasons:

Backdated prior to the week in which the individual reported if the individual presents to the department sufficient grounds to justify or excuse the delay;

There is scheduled filing in the following week because of a mass layoff;

The failure of the department to recognize the expiration of the claimant's previous benefit year;

The individual is given incorrect advice by a workforce development employee;

The claimant filed an interstate claim against another state which has been determined as ineligible;

Failure on the part of the employer to comply with the provisions of the law or of these rules;

Coercion or intimidation exercised by the employer to prevent the prompt filing of such claim;

Failure of the department to discharge its responsibilities promptly in connection with such claim, the department shall extend the period during which such claim may be filed to a date which shall be not less than one week after the individual has received appropriate notice of potential rights to benefits, provided, that no such claim may be filed after the 13 weeks subsequent to the end of the benefit year during which the week of unemployment occurred. In the event continuous jurisdiction is exercised under the provisions of the law, the department may, in its discretion, extend the period during which claims, with respect to week of unemployment affected by such redetermination, may be filed.

(3) When the benefit year expires on any day but Saturday, the effective date of the new claim is the Sunday of the current week in which the claim is filed even though it may overlap into the old benefit year up to six days. However, backdating shall not be allowed at the change of the calendar quarter if the backdating would cause an overlap of the same quarter in two base periods. When the overlap situation occurs, the effective date of the new claim may be postdated up to six days. If the claimant has benefits remaining on the old claim, the claimant may be eligible for benefits for that period by extending the old benefit year up to six days.

The claimant wants to backdate his claim because he was not eligible to receive short-term disability payments. He has not established sufficient grounds under the statute to justify or excuse the delay in filing his claim during the first week of unemployment. Backdating is denied.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated December 24, 2012, reference 01, is affirmed. The claimant's request to backdate his claim is denied.

---

Susan D. Ackerman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/tll