

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

AMY M HOLLOPETER
3438 - 240TH ST
HARTWICK IA 52232

KWIK TRIP INC
1626 OAK ST
PO BOX 2107
LACROSSE WI 54602

Appeal Number: 04A-UI-03859-SWT
OC 02/22/04 R 02
Claimant: Respondent (1)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated March 26, 2004, reference 01. A telephone hearing was held on April 28, 2004. The claimant participated in the hearing. Julie Kriegel participated on behalf of the employer with a witness, Melissa Delaney. Exhibit A-1 was admitted into evidence at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

An unemployment insurance decision was mailed to the employer's last known address of record on March 26, 2004. The decision concluded the claimant's discharge was not for work-connected misconduct and stated the decision was final unless a written appeal was postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by April 5, 2004.

The employer received the decision within the ten-day period for appealing the decision. The employer filed a written appeal on April 6, 2004, which is after the time period for appealing had expired. The employer delayed in filing its appeal because the employment specialist did not receive word that the district leader wanted to appeal until after the deadline for appealing.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this case is whether the employer filed a timely appeal.

Iowa Code Section 96.6-2 provides in pertinent part:

The representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. . . . Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision.

The Iowa Supreme Court has ruled that appeals from unemployment insurance decisions must be filed within the time limit set by statute and the administrative law judge has no authority to review a decision if a timely appeal is not filed. Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979); Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979). In this case, the employer's appeal was filed after the deadline for appealing expired.

The next question is whether the employer had a reasonable opportunity to file an appeal in a timely fashion. Hendren v. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). There is no evidence that establishes the employer did not have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The failure to file a timely appeal was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service, which under 871 IAC 24.35(2) would excuse the delay in filing an appeal. Since the appeal was not filed timely, there is no jurisdiction to make a decision on the merits of the appeal.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated March 26, 2004, reference 01, is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the unemployment insurance decision holding the claimant qualified for benefits remains in effect.

saw/kjf