# Brigham Young University Law School BYU Law Digital Commons

Utah Court of Appeals Briefs

1993

# Georgina Valls v. Department of Employment Security : Brief of Appellant

Utah Court of Appeals

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\_ca1
Part of the Law Commons

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Court of Appeals; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Georgina Valls; pro se.

Emma R. Thomas, K. Allan Zabel; attorneys for respondent.

# Recommended Citation

Brief of Appellant, Georgina Valls v. Department of Employment Security, No. 930830 (Utah Court of Appeals, 1993). https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\_cal/5716

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 Court of Appeals Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at <a href="http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah\_court\_briefs/policies.html">http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah\_court\_briefs/policies.html</a>. Please contact the Repository Manager at hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu with questions or feedback.



#### IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

	0000000	· <b>-</b>
GEORGINA VALLS, Plaintiff/Appellant,	)	APPELLANT'S BRIEF
-v-	)	
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, Defendant/Appellee	)	Court of Appeals Cas Nr. 930830 CA
	0000000	· <b>-</b>

APPEAL FROM THE BOARD OF REVIEW, THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF UTAH, STATE OF UTAH, COMMISSIONER STEPHEN M.HADLEY

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

SECURITY

140 E 300 S

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84147

Defendant/Appellee

GEORGINA VALLS
3827 S 300 E Nr. 6

SALT LAKE CITY,

UTAH 84115

Plaintiff/Appellant

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	Page 1
RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	3

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

#### RULES

Utah Administration Code - Unemployment Insurance Rules Code R562-4c-1, 1993

#### STATUTES

```
Utah Code R562-4c-3, Available
Utah Code R562-4c-3.1.a(1) and (2)
Utah Code R562-4c-3.3.a
Utah Code R562-4c-3.4.(1), (2), (3), (4) and (5)
Utah Code R562-4c-3.5.a
Utah Code R562-4c-3.5.(3)
Utah Code R562-4c-3.7
Utah Code R562-4c-4.2
```

#### STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Appeal from the decision of the Board of Review, the Industrial Commission of Utah, State of Utah, denying Ms. Georgina Valls the unemployment benefits for the period of June 27 to September 24, 1993.

#### RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL

The decision of the Board of Review to be reversed to authorize the payment of the unemployment benefits to Ms. Georgina Valls for the period of June 27 to September 24, 1993.

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I was eligible, able and available to work inmediately (starting June 27 1993) 40 hours a week.

## STATEMENTS OF THE FACTS

I had been working for almost two years prior to the 27 June 1993 for less than 40 hours a week. According to general requirement for availability, I am initially considered available without regard to that restriction. At the time of the claim , I was authorized, ready and willing to work 40 hours a week.

My ability to work was subject to the need or desire of any U.S. employer to hire me because of my skills and experience, and not by means of personal economic necessity.

Even though my claim for unemployment benefits was denied stating that any person has to be able to accept work inmediately, there are several rules (Unemployment Insurance Rules - Utah Code R562-4c-1,1993) that contradict this reason. In the case, for instance, of wage restriction, the claimant is allowed to file for up to 2/3 of his weeks of entitlement before he is forced to accept any job for less than the desired wage. These 2/3 would be in most cases more than 60 days. The Administrative Law Judge did not consider that some companies have a permanent job order with the Job Service asking for certain type of employees. In this case, the document authorizing these companies to hire me would be signed inmediately by the Department of Labor and I could start working inmediately also.

The company that I was working for before the time of unemployment, had paid all the dues to the Job Service as unemployment taxes for me, every quarter.

I have complied with all the requirements of the Employment Security Department, attended a workshop, met the number of companies interviewed in-person, as well as other many contacts by phone.

#### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

I believe that the decision of the Board of Review is discriminatory, as it was the decision of the Administrative Law Judge. I consider my petition for payment of unemploment benefits to be legitimate and appropriate according to the facts stated before.

Dated this 25th day of May, 1994.

Georgina Valls 3827 So 300 E Nr. 6 Salt Lake City, Utah 84115 Exorgina Palls

## Certificate of mailing

I hereby certify that I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing docketing statement by deposititing the same in the United States mail, postage prepaid to the following:

Department of Employment Segurity 140 E 300 So 2nd Floor Salt Lake City, Ut 84147

Dated this 25th day of May, 1994.