

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

ZACHARY POINTER
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 09A-UI-00521-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CEDAR GRAPHICS INC
Employer

**OC: 12/14/08 R: 03
Claimant: Respondent (4)**

Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Cedar Graphics, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated January 7, 2009, reference 01, which held it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on January 1, 2008 and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on January 29, 2009. The claimant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which he could be contacted, and therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Darren Otte, Human Resources Manager. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer's protest in this matter was timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and 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 December 18, 2008. The protest was due on December 29, 2008. The employer did not receive the notice of claim until January 6, 2009 and filed its protest on the same date.

The claimant has requalified for benefits since the separation from the employer.

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.

The employer did not have an opportunity to protest the notice of claim, because the notice was not received in a timely fashion. Without timely notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The employer filed the protest immediately upon receipt of the notice of claim. Therefore, the protest shall be accepted as timely.

The administrative law judge further concludes that the claimant has requalified for benefits since the separation from this employer. Accordingly, benefits are allowed and the account of the employer shall not be charged.

DECISION:

The employer's protest is timely. The unemployment insurance decision dated January 7, 2009, reference 01, is modified in favor of the appellant. The claimant has requalified for benefits since the separation. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The employer's account shall not be charged.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css