

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**RONALD A SAENZ**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-03400-S2T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**COUNCIL BLUFFS PAYROLL COMPANY**  
Employer

**OC: 11/11/12  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Employer filed a timely appeal from the March 19, 2013, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits and found the protest untimely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on April 23, 2013. The claimant did participate. The employer did participate through Anne Holoch, Senior Human Resources Generalist, and Kristin Huff, Claims Service Representative. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the employer filed a timely protest.

**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 November 20, 2012, and received by employer on November 23, 2012. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked, faxed or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer believes it filed a timely protest because it generated a letter to the Appeals Section dated November 30, 2012. According to the employer's system, if a letter is generated on a particular day, it is postmarked that day. The letter is a response to the Notice of Claim form but not a completion of the form. The bottom of the Notice of Claim states, "Supporting documents may be submitted with this form for consideration at the telephone fact finding." The employer submitted supporting documentation but did not supply the notice form. Employer did not file a protest until March 8, 2013, which is after the ten-day period had expired. No good cause reason has been established for the delay.

**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 appeal regarding the separation from employment.

The administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law. *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 4.35(2).* The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to 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).

The protest contains the following warning. "The protest information you provide below must be CERTIFIED CORRECT BY SIGNING AND COMPLETING THE SIGNATURE BOX. Incomplete protest forms will be returned to the employer with no extension to the protest period." The employer's response letter was not certified as correct.

**DECISION:**

The March 19, 2013, reference 02, decision is affirmed. Employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

---

Beth A. Scheetz  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css