

1981

Gerald L. Woodmansee v. The Industrial Commission of Utah, Department of Employment Security : Brief of Appellant

Utah Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; funding for digitization provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Utah State Library, and sponsored by the S.J. Quinney Law Library; machine-generated OCR, may contain errorsDavid Wilkinson, K. Allan Zabel, Lorin R. Blauer

Recommended Citation

Brief of Appellant, *Woodmansee v. Indus. Comm. Of Utah*, No. 17352 (Utah Supreme Court, 1981).
https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2/2510

This Brief of Appellant is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –) by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF UTAH

GERALD L. WOODMANSEE, :
 :
 PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT, :
 :
 VS. : CASE NO. 17352
 :
 THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF :
 UTAH, DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT :
 SECURITY. :
 :
 :

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

WRIT OF REVIEW FROM DECISION OF THE BOARD OF REVIEW, THE
INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF UTAH, DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT
SECURITY.

GERALD L. WOODMANSEE
Plaintiff
377 Catherine St.
Salt Lake City, Ut. 84116

ROBERT B. HANSEN, Attorney General

FLOYD G. ASTIN
K. ALLAN ZABEL
Special Assistants Attorney General

Attorneys for Defendant
The Industrial Commission of Utah,
Department of Employment Security.

FILED

FEB 13 1981

Clk, Supreme Court, Utah

NATURE OF THE CASE

This case involves a petition by the Appellant GERALD L. WOODMANSEE, to address the Honorable Judges of the Supreme Court of the State of Utah in regards to the summate denial of claims for unemployment compensation during the subject periods of time.

DISPOSITION OF BOARD OF REVIEW

On August 23, 1980, the Board of Review of the Industrial Commission of Utah upheld the decision of the Appeal Referee to deny unemployment claims.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE COURT

Petitioner, Gerald L. Woodmansee seeks a reversal of previous adjudications. More importantly, he concludes by listing the major points that have motivated this appeal to the highest court in the state of Utah.

STATEMENT OF CONCERNS

1. The appellant feels that he has been mislabeled as an Educator and denied benefits unduly.
2. The appellant is certified as a Speech Pathologist and audiologist by the American Speech and Hearing Association.
3. The appellant is hired for only 9 months of the school year. He feels the need for a full year employment consideration in order to support his family.
4. The appellant Gerald L. Woodmansee, further feels that the State Unemployment statues have been forced by Federal considerations and deny him his individual rights.

SUMMARY

The petitioner, Gerald L. Woodmansee thanks the Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court for the service they render their fellow citizens and personally express gratitude to them. He feels that despite the opinion of some, that this case is "open and shut" against him, it is not.

The petitioner feels wronged by the decisions and laws upon which they were made. As the apostle Paul appealed to the highest tribunal, Gerald Woodmansee asks this Supreme Courts permission to address them and express his grievances in this case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
STATEMENT OF NATURE OF THE CASE.....	1
DISPOSITION BELOW.....	2
RELIEF SOUGHT ON REVIEW.....	3
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	4
ARGUMENT.....	5
POINT I.....	3
IN REVIEWING A DETERMINATION OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION UNDER THE UTAH EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ACT THE COURT WILL AFFIRM THE COMMISSION'S FINDINGS IF SUCH ARE SUSTAINED BY SUBSTANTIAL COMPETENT EVIDENCE.	
POINT II.....	3
THERE IS A PRESUMPTION THAT A STATUTE OR ORDER OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE BODY ACTING PURSUANT TO STATUTORY AUTHORITY IS CONSTITUTIONAL IN ALL CASES AND THE PRESUMPTION IS GREATER WHERE THE INTEREST OF THE STATE IS INVOLVED THAN IT IS WHERE ONLY PRIVATE INTERESTS ARE AFFECTED.	
POINT III.....	5
THE BOARD OF REVIEW OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF UTAH DID NOT ERR IN DENYING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS TO THE PLAINTIFF.	
CONCLUSION.....	6

CASES CITED

<u>Baird v. State</u> , 574 P. 2d 713 (1978).....	5
<u>Continental Oil Company v. Board of Review of the Industrial Commission of Utah</u> , 568 P. 2d 727 (Utah 1977).....	3
<u>Gocke v. Wiesley</u> , 18 U. 2d 245, 420 P. 2d 44, 45 (1966).....	3
<u>Kennecott Copper Corporation Employees v. Department of Employment Security</u> , 12 U. 2d 262, 372 P. 2d 987 (1962).....	3
<u>Martinez v. Board of Review</u> , 25 U. 2d 131, 477 P. 2d 587 (1970).....	3
<u>Members of Iron Workers Union of Provo v. Industrial Commission</u> , 104 Utah 242, 248; 139 P. 2d 208, 211 (1943).....	3
<u>Norvill v. State</u> , 98 Utah 170, 97 P. 2d 937 (1940).....	5

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

OTHER AUTHORITIES CITED	PAGE
16 Am. Jur. 2d, Const. Law, 144.....	5

STATUTES CITED

Utah Code Annotated, 1953, 35-4-5(i).....	1,2,4,5,6
Utah Code Annotated, 1953, 35-4-10(i).....	1