

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**JOHN C MCCONNELL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-04356-NT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**CHICK-FUL-A OF CORALRIDGE MALL**  
Employer

**OC: 01/04/09**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed a timely appeal from the March 9, 2009, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits and found the protest untimely. After due notice was issued a hearing was held by telephone conference call on April 14, 2009. The claimant participated. The employer participated by Mr. Robert Schmidt, Owner/Operator.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer's protest is timely.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record the administrative law judge finds: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on March 9, 2009 and received by the employer at the company's corporate office, the address that the employer had utilized as their official address of record on the date that the notice of claim was forwarded. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked, faxed or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer did not file a protest until March 5, 2009 which is after the ten-day period had expired. No good reason has been established for the delay. The notice of claim was sent to the address chosen by the employer. The employer did not take sufficient action to insure that his new business address was officially changed with Iowa Workforce Development's tax section.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides in pertinent part:

2. Initial determination. A representative designated by the director shall promptly notify all interested parties to the claim of its filing, and the parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of the filing of the claim by ordinary mail to the last known address to protest payment of benefits to the claimant.

Another portion of this same Code section dealing with timeliness of an appeal from a representative's decision states that such an appeal must be filed within ten days after notification of that decision was mailed. In addressing an issue of timeliness of an appeal under that portion of this Code section, the Iowa Supreme Court held that this statute prescribing the time for notice of appeal clearly limits the time to do so, and that compliance with the appeal notice provision is mandatory and jurisdictional. Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979).

The administrative law judge considers the reasoning and holding of that court in that decision to be controlling on this portion of that same Iowa Code section which deals with a time limit in which to file a protest after notification of the filing of the claim has been mailed. The employer has not shown any good cause for not complying with the jurisdictional time limit. Therefore, the administrative law judge is without jurisdiction to entertain any appeal regarding the separation from employment.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer has failed to protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law. The delay was due to the employer leaving its address of record at a corporate headquarter address resulting in a delay in the form being forwarded to the owner/operator's business location. The delay was not due to any agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to 871 IAC 4.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6-2 and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's termination of employment. See Beardslee v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979); Franklin v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979) and Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company of Cedar Rapids v. Employment Appeal Board, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

**DECISION:**

The March 9, 2009, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest and the decision of the representative remains in effect.

---

Terence P. Nice  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

pjs/pjs