

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

KATHRYN F BARUTH
200 W MAPLE ST
WEST UNION IA 52175

GOOD SAMARITAN SOCIETY INC
c/o TALX UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-09448-CT
OC: 08/08/04 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (1-R)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed the representative's decision dated August 26, 2004, reference 02, which concluded it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on May 12, 2004, and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. A telephone hearing was scheduled and held on September 27, 2004, pursuant to due notice. Ms. Baruth participated personally. The employer participated by Mary Heller, Office Manager, and Timothy Skurdal, Administrator. Three attempts were made to contact the employer's additional witness, Charon Wade of Talx UC Express, but the number was answered by a voice mail recording. Ms. Wade did not respond to a message left for her.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on August 12, 2004, and received by the employer within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer did not effect a protest until August 25, 2004, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

The employer indicated in the letter of appeal that the protest to Ms. Baruth's claim was faxed to Workforce Development on August 23, 2004. The employer has not submitted any fax transmittal confirmation to verify the date the document was faxed. The protest was stamped received by Workforce Development at 10:59 a.m. on August 25, 2004.

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 protest regarding the separation from employment.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer failed to effect a timely protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law, and 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 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to effect a 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. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979); Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979) and Pepsi-Cola Bottling Company v. Employment Appeal Board, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa App. 1990).

Ms. Baruth has been coded as group "3" on her claim. She is no longer temporarily unemployed and should be required to make two in-person job contacts on a weekly basis. This matter will be remanded to Claims to determine if the group code should be changed.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated August 26, 2004, reference 02, is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect. Benefits are allowed, provided Ms. Baruth satisfies all other conditions of eligibility. This matter is remanded to Claims to determine whether Ms. Baruth's group code should be changed.

cfc/b