IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU

TAMMIE J WOLTER

Claimant

APPEAL 17A-UI-10756-NM-T

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

JIFFY MART 2

Employer

OC: 09/10/17

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the October 3, 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 November 7, 2017. The claimant did not participate. The employer participated through Deborah Nelsen. Also present on behalf of the employer, but not testifying were Brad Williams and Bonnie Cossell. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

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 mailed to employer's address of record on September 10, 2017. That address belonged to the employer's accountant and registered agent and was a correct mailing address for that individual. The employer's accountant then mailed the Notice of Claim to the employer's direct mailing address. 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 September 25, 2017. The employer received the notice in the mail from its accountant on September 28, 2017 and mailed its protest in the following day, which is after the ten-day period had expired. Nelsen testified she spoke with her accountant, who was not certain when she received the notice, but who gave no indication that there was any reason to believe there were any issues with or delays in the mailing of the notice. Nelsen further testified mail from the accountant's office generally arrives at to her address within two business days.

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 § 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 not shown any good cause for not complying with the jurisdictional time limit. Therefore, the administrative law judge is without jurisdiction to entertain any appeal regarding the separation from employment.

The Notice of Claim was mailed on September 10, 2017. The employer's agent did not give any reason to believe there had been any delay in the mailing. The employer's agent also chose to pass the notice along via regular mail, after an unknown period of time had passed, rather than immediately and directly notifying the employer. It is the responsibility of the employer, or its designated agent, to ensure that the agency has a preferred mailing address. Notice of the Claim was sent to the address of record via the employer's agent. The delay was not 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). No other good cause reason has been established for the delay. The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's termination of 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:

nm/rvs

The October 3, 2017, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Nicole Merrill	
Administrative Law Judge	
Decision Dated and Mailed	