

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI	
KATRINA A SHRIVER Claimant	APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-04827-MT
CARE INITIATIVES Employer	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION
	OC: 11/12/06 R: 03 Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed the representative's decision dated May 8, 2007, reference 04, that concluded it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on February 24, 2007, and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. A telephone hearing was scheduled and held on May 30, 2007, pursuant to due notice. Claimant participated personally. Employer participated by Ted Arndt, Hearings Representative TALX with witness Phyllis Farrell, UIC TALX. Exhibits One the Two were admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

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

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 November 21, 2006, 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 April 25, 2007, which is after the ten-day period had expired. Employer had received the protest on November 27, 2006 and mailed the protest letter out December 1, 2006. Workforce Development did not receive the letter of protest mailed December 1, 2006. Employer was then sent a Statement of Charges on April 15, 2007 which employer received April 23, 2007. Employer appealed from the statement of charges by letter dated April 25, 2007.

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 shown good cause for not complying with the jurisdictional time limit. Therefore, the administrative law judge is with jurisdiction to entertain the protest regarding the separation from employment.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer effected a timely protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law, and the delay was due to 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 effected a timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge has 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).

This matter is remanded to the claims section for a determination on eligibility caused by the separation of employment dated February 24, 2006.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated May 8, 2007, reference 04, is reversed and remanded. The employer has filed a timely protest, and the decision of the representative is reversed. This matter is remanded to Claims for a decision on the separation of February 24, 2007.

Marlon Mormann
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

mdm/css