

**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**

**VIRGINIA R CHACON
721 S 7th AVE
WASHINGTON IA 52353**

**HCM INC
c/o TALX UCM SERVICES INC
PO BOX 283
SAINT LOUIS MO 63166-0283**

**Appeal Number: 04A-UI-08951-S2T
OC: 07/25/04 R: 03
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 Protest
Section 96.5-1 - Voluntary Quit
Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed the representative's decision dated August 17, 2004, reference 02, that concluded it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on June 19, 2004, 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 September 13, 2004. The claimant participated personally and through Kimberly Kistler, former employee. The employer participated by Debra Mullins, Hearings Representative, and Kym Hauser, Administrator. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony of the witnesses and 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 July 30, 2004, 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 signed the notice of claim and faxed it to the employer's Saint Louis office on August 9, 2004. The employer at the Saint Louis office did not effect a protest until August 11, 2004, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

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

The administrative law judge concludes the employer failed to effect a timely protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law, and the delay was not due to any 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 failed to effect a timely protest, pursuant to Iowa Code Section 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. 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).

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated August 17, 2004, reference 02, is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand

and remain in full force and effect. The claimant is eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits, provided she meets all other eligibility requirements.

bas/tjc