

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

LESLIE M ACORD

Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-01125-JCT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

KESHAV CORPORATION

Employer

OC: 12/25/16

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the January 27, 2017, (reference 04) unemployment insurance decision that found the protest untimely and allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on February 21, 2017. The claimant did not register a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate. The employer participated by Richa Patel, general manager/area manager. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received.

ISSUE:

Is the employer's protest timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to employer's address of record on December 28, 2016, and was not received by employer within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that the employer protest response is due ten days from the initial notice date and gave a response deadline of January 9, 2017.

The employer did not file a protest response until January 17, 2017, which is after the ten-day period had expired because Richa Patel and Rushi Patel (the person listed for the address of record) were on vacation until January 16, 2017. The business was still in operation during the Patels' absence from the office but does not have anyone review mail at the corporate office for potentially urgent matters while they are away.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to protest response within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law.

Iowa Code § 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.

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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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.

In this case, the employer operates a hotel, and uses a corporate address of record for receiving mail from Iowa Workforce Development. Ms. Richa Patel and Rushi Patel (the listed contact for the address of record) were out of town until late January 16, 2017 on vacation. No one checked the mail in their absence, although hotel continued to operate and has other management. Consequently, their absence also coincided with the ten day period to respond to the notice of claim, and so when the employer returned to the office, and responded to the claim on January 17, 2017, it was over a week after the due date.

The employer's choice to hold the mail in the Patels' absence was a business decision. The employer has not shown good cause for failure to comply with the jurisdictional time limit or that the delay was due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). Therefore, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's separation from employment or authority to remand for a fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.6(2).

The administrative law judge would note that the Agency provides employers with an opportunity to receive notices of claim via email through its SIDES system. Additional information regarding SIDES can be located in the employer handbook available online or <http://info.uisides.org>.

DECISION:

The January 27, 2017, (reference 04) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the unemployment insurance decision shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/rvs