IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

ARTURO MANZO MACIAS

Claimant

APPEAL 20A-UI-01843-SC-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

CRC&B CONCRETE LLC

Employer

OC: 12/22/19

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

On February 27, 2020, CRC&B Concrete, LLC (employer) filed an appeal from the February 25, 2020, reference 03, unemployment insurance decision that found the protest untimely and allowed Arturo Manzo Macias (claimant) to receive benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on March 17, 2020. The claimant participated personally. The employer participated through Renee Lehman, Business Office Manager. Spanish interpretation was provided by Francisco (employee number 12087) from CTS Language Link. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, including the notice of claim and protest.

ISSUE:

Is the employer's protest timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant separated from employment on July 20, 2018 and filed a claim for benefits effective December 22, 2019. The notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on December 30, 2019, and was 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, 2020.

On January 6, the employer provided a response stating the claimant had never worked for the employer. On January 31, the agency mailed a return of notice of claim showing the employer had paid wages to the claimant during his base period and reminded the employer that the protest period expired on January 9. The employer received this documentation on or about February 3. Renee Lehman, Business Office Manager, then contacted ADP, the employer's payroll company, and discovered that the claimant had worked for the employer. On February 6, she resubmitted the employer's protest stating the claimant had voluntarily quit to accept other employment. The employer did not contact ADP the first time because they confused the claimant's name with another person's name and did not think it was necessary.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to file 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.

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.

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 lowa 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 lowa 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 filed its protest after the January 9 deadline and has not established that the delay was due to any error by or misinformation from the agency or delay or other action of the United States

Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). As the employer failed to timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's separation from employment. See, Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979); Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv., 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979) and Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. v. Emp't Appeal Bd., 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990).

DECISION:

The February 25, 2020, reference 03, unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Stephanie R. Callahan Administrative Law Judge

Supranie R Can

March 27, 2020

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn