

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

LAURA HINER
Claimant

DAC INC
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-02305-JP-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

OC: 02/05/17
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the February 24, 2017, (reference 01) 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 March 23, 2017. Claimant participated. The employer participated by human resources coordinator Maggi Muhlhausen, HCBS coordinator Tashsa O'Connor, and regional HCBS director PJ Gregorich-Roling.

ISSUE:

Is the employer's protest timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant's notice of claim was provided to the employer in the SIDES system. The employer received an e-mail notification of claimant's notice of claim on February 10, 2017 at 1:01 a.m. 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 February 21, 2017. The employer did not file a protest response until February 22, 2017, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

Ms. Muhlhausen received the employer's separation paperwork from claimant's supervisors on February 10, 2017; however, the paperwork had incorrect information. Ms. Muhlhausen then received the correct information regarding claimant's separation from claimant's supervisors on February 21, 2017. On February 21, 2017, Ms. Muhlhausen testified she attempted to file the employer's protest but was unable to due to technology issues. Ms. Muhlhausen was unable to get to Iowa Workforce Development's (IWD) website to file the employer's protest. Ms. Muhlhausen did not contact IWD about the issue on February 21, 2017. Ms. Muhlhausen testified she is not sure if it was the employer's computer issue or IWD's website. Ms. Muhlhausen did not try to fax or mail the protest to IWD. On February 22, 2017, Ms. Muhlhausen submitted the employer's protest through the SIDES system. Ms. Muhlhausen never contacted IWD to see if IWD was having an issue with its website on February 21, 2017.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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 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. 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(1) Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

a. If transmitted via the United States postal service on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.

b. If transmitted by any means other than the United States postal service on the date it is received by the division.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

- a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.
- b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.
- c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.
- d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

The employer did not file its protest within the jurisdictional time limit due to technology issues. The employer did not establish that the technology issues the employer experience were a result of IWD's website or agency area. Furthermore, after the employer was unable to file its protest due to technology issues, the employer failed to immediately contact IWD, fax its protest, or mail its protest on February 21, 2017.

The employer has not shown any 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).

DECISION:

The February 24, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the unemployment insurance decision shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Jeremy Peterson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jp/