IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

CAMERON M TINNES

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 22A-UI-02675-JTT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

FLAGGER PROS USA LLC

Employer

OC: 04/04/21

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the January 7, 2022, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant provided the claimant was otherwise eligible, that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits, and that held the employer's protest could not be considered because it was untimely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on February 23, 2022. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice instructions to register a telephone number for the hearing and did not participate. Max McGonigle, Human Resources Associate, represented the employer. Exhibit 1 was received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the notice of claim/protest received by and processed by Iowa Workforce Development. The administrative law judge notes that the Appeals Bureau mailed a copy of said notice of claim/protest to the employer on February 11, 2022 with a cover sheet that directed the employer to have the document available for the hearing, but the employer did not bring the notice of claim/protest to the appeal hearing.

ISSUE:

Whether the employer's protest of the claim for benefits was timely. Whether there is good cause to deem the employer's late protest as timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On May 26, 2021, lowa Workforce Development mailed a notice of claim concerning the above claimant to the employer's Ames address of record. The notice of claim contained a warning that any protest must be postmarked, faxed or returned by the due date set forth on the notice, which was June 7, 2021. The notice of claim was received at the employer's address of record in a timely manner, prior to the deadline for protest. A trainer wrote the employer protest information on the notice of claim form, but left blank the line for a certification signature and signature date. The employer witness was not involved in receiving the notice of claim or responding to the notice of claim. The employer witness asserts the notice of claim was received by the employer on June 2, 2021 and that the employer emailed a protest that same day. However, it is unlikely the notice of claim, mailed from Des Moines, would have taken a week to reach the employer's address in Ames. The employer witness does not know where the trainer emailed the notice of

claim to. The employer witness did not have the email correspondence at the time of the hearing. Iowa Workforce Development customer service date-stamped the protest as received by IWD on June 9, 2021. It is unlikely a protest emailed to Iowa Workforce Development on June 2, 2021 would take a week to reach IWD.

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 lowa 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 (lowa 1979). The administrative law judge considers the reasoning and holding of the court to be controlling on this portion of that same lowa 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.

Iowa Administrative Code Rule 871-24.8(2)(a) and (b) provide as follows:

- (2) Responding by employing units to a notice of the filing of an initial claim or a request for wage and separation information and protesting the payment of benefits.
- a. The employing unit which receives a Form 65-5317, Notice of Claim, or a Form 68-0221, Request for Wage and Separation Information, must, within ten days of the date of the notice or request, submit to the department wage or separation information that affects the individual's rights to benefits, including any facts which disclose that the individual separated from employment voluntarily and without good cause attributable to the employer or was discharged for misconduct in connection with employment.
- b. The employing unit may protest the payment of benefits if the protest is postmarked within ten days of the date of the notice of the filing of an initial claim. In the event that the tenth day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday, the protest period is extended to the next working day of the department. If the employing unit has filed a timely report of facts that might adversely affect the individual's benefit rights, the report shall be considered as a protest to the payment of benefits.

Iowa Administrative Code Rule 871-24.35(1) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(1) Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

- a. If transmitted via the United States Postal Service on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.
- b. If transmitted via the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.
- c. If transmitted by any means other than those outlined in paragraphs 24.35(1)"a" and "b", on the date it is received by the division.

Iowa Administrative Code Rule 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

- (2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.
- a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.
- b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.
- c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.
- d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

The employer's protest was untimely. The administrative law judge notes the employer's sole witness for the hearing lacked personal knowledge regarding the employer's receipt of the notice of claim and response to the notice of claim. The employer's protest was filed on June 9, 2021, the date lowa Workforce Development received the undated protest. The employer received the notice of claim in a timely manner, had a reasonable opportunity to file a protest by the June 7, 2021 protest deadline, but filed a late protest on June 9, 2021. The evidence establishes the employer's failure to file a timely protest was not attributable to Workforce Development error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. There is not good cause to treat the late protest as a timely protest. Because the protest was untimely, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to disturb the Agency's initial determination regarding the nature of the claimant's separation from the employment, the claimant's eligibility for benefits, or the employer's liability for benefits. The Agency's initial determination of the claimant's eligibility for benefits and the employer's liability for benefits shall remain in effect.

DECISION:

The January 7, 2022, reference 02, decision is affirmed. The employer's protest was untimely. The claimant is eligible for benefits, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The employer's account may be charged for benefits.

James E. Timberland Administrative Law Judge

James & Timberland

February 25, 2022
Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/scn