

1995

Reese W. Griffiths v. Board Review of the Industrial Commision of Utah : Unknown

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.

Reese W. Griffiths; Claimant -Petitioner, Pro Se.

Emma R. Thomas; K. Allan Zabel; Attorneys for Respondent.

Recommended Citation

Legal Brief, *Griffiths v. Board Review of the Industrial Commision of Utah*, No. 950782 (Utah Court of Appeals, 1995).
https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1/7017

This Legal Brief 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 http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah_court_briefs/policies.html. Please contact the Repository Manager at hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu with questions or feedback.

FILED

MAY 01 1996

COURT OF APPEALS

REESE W. GRIFFITHS
CLAIMANT PETITIONER, PRO SE
P O BOX 87
MINERSVILLE, UT 84752

ORIGINAL

UTAH COURT OF APPEALS
BRIEF

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

UTAH
DOCUMENT
KFU

50

.A10

DOCKET NO. 950782-CA

ANSWER TO BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS
Case No. 950782-CA

REESE W. GRIFFITHS,
Petitioner,

vs..
BOARD OF REVIEW,
Respondents,

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

TO THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS AND THE HONORABLE JUDGES THEREIN:

Claimant does not accept that Board of Reviews position is reasonable and rational. They have rules that all adversely affected parties will be participants. Claimant was not a participant.

It is not reasonable or rational that Claimant went without income from any source from April until the end of May. Employment was not offered by Richardson Construction Co. Claimant wanted work.

Claimant was forced by no offer of employment from Richardson Construction to file for benefits on May 28, 1995.

Claimant accepted any and asked for any employment Richardson Construction had available. In his telephone contacts following move, He specifically asked "Please notify me of ANY work you have for me.". Claimant demonstrated his willingness to accept this employment.

Claimant had no reason to expect employers "Slow-Down" had indeed ended. Claimant was never told that if he moved to S.L.C. he would have continuing employment. No such promised exists or was relayed.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

SERVED by mailing, postage prepaid to the following on the 29th
of April, 1996 two copies to:

EMMA R. THOMAS #4681

K. ALLAN ZABEL #3598

Attornies for Respondent
Board of Review
140 East 300 South
P O Box 45244
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0244


REESE W. GRIFFITHS

Claimant never "quit" Claimant had to move as employer could not keep him fully employed.

IN ANSWER TO SUMMARY:

Employer never offered employment in the Salt Lake area that was refused. Claimant would have accepted any employment offered by Richardson Construction ANYWHERE, ANYPLACE, ANYTIME.

Claimant never limited himself to accepting "only out-of-state" work.

The Board of Review should not have expected additional evidence from the claimant following a favorable decision by ALJ.

No work was offered to claimant to "quit" before moving out of S.L.C.

The Richardson Company through their legal representative offered only excuses for not offering work after Claimant filed claim.

While Richardson Company officials drive around in their LUXURY VEHICLES on vacation, one is asked to believe, destitute Claimant refuses to work for them? This I say is not reasonable or rational.

This is not compassionate, nor justice!

ARE THEY TO GROW WEALTHY ON THE TRAGEDY OF REESE?

WHILE THEY OFFER NO EMPLOYMENT, THEY FIGHT BENEFITS CLAIMED??

WHAT KIND OF BENEFITS ARE THESE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED??

FILED

MAY 31 1996

COURT OF APPEALS

REESE W. GRIFFITHS
CLAIMANT PETITIONER, PRO SE
P O BOX 87
MINERSVILLE, UTAH 84752

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

REESE W. GRIFFITHS,
Petitioner,

vs..
BOARD OF REVIEW,
Respondents,

ANSWER TO BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS
Case No. 950782-CA

TO THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS AND THE HONORABLE JUDGES THEREIN:

Claimant does not accept that Board of Reviews position is reasonable and rational. They have rules that all adversely affected parties will be participants. Claimant was not a participant.

It is not reasonable or rational that Claimant went without income from any source from April until the end of May. Employment was not offered by Richardson Construction Co. Claimant wanted work.

Claimant was forced by no offer of employment from Richardson Construction to file for benefits on May 28, 1995.

Claimant accepted any and asked for any employment Richardson Construction had available. In his telephone contacts following move, He specifically asked "Please notify me of ANY work you have for me.". Claimant demonstrated his willingness to accept this employment.

Claimant had no reason to expect employers "Slow-Down" had indeed ended. Claimant was never told that if he moved to S.L.C. he would have continuing employment. No such promise exists or was relayed.

Claimant never "Quit" Claimant had to move as employer could not keep him fully employed.

IN ANSWER TO SUMMARY:

Employer never offered employment in the Salt Lake area that was refused. Claimant would have accepted any employment offered by Richardson Construction ANYWHERE, ANYPLACE, ANYTIME.

Claimant never limited himself to accepting "only out-of-state" work.

The Board of Review should not have expected additional evidence from the claimant following a favorable decision by ALJ.

No work was offered to claimant to "Quit" before moving out of S.L.C.

The Richardson Company through their legal representative offered only excuses for not offering work after Claimant filed claim.

While Richardson Company officials drive around in their LUXURY VEHICLES on vacation, one is asked to believe, destitute Claimant refuses to work for them? This I say is not reasonable or rational.

This is not compassionate, nor justice!

ARE THEY TO GROW WEALTHY ON THE TRAGEDY OF REESE?

WHILE THEY OFFER NO EMPLOYMENT, THEY FIGHT BENEFITS CLAIMED??

WHAT KIND OF BENEFITS ARE THESE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED??


CERTIFICAT OF MAILING

SERVED by mailing, postage prepaid to the following on the 29th
of April, 1996 two copies to:

EMMA R. THOMAS #4681

K. ALLAN ZABEL #3598

Attornies for Respondent
Board of Review
140 East 300 South
P O Box 45244
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0244


REESE W. GRIFFIN