

**BEFORE THE
EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
Lucas State Office Building, 4TH Floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
eab.iowa.gov**

LANCE N KUEHL	:	HEARING NUMBER: 22B-UI-02113
Claimant	:	
	:	
and	:	EMPLOYMENT APPEAL BOARD
	:	DECISION
	:	
JAGUAR ENTERPRISES INC	:	
Employer	:	

NOTICE

The Employer The Employer appealed this case to the Employment Appeal Board. The members of the Employment Appeal Board reviewed the entire record. The Appeal Board finds it cannot affirm the administrative law judge's decision. The Employment Appeal Board **REVERSES** and **REMANDS** as set forth below.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

On November 18, 2020, a Notice of Claim was mailed to the Employer. The Notice was mailed to the Employer's last known address as supplied to Iowa Workforce. The Employer timely protested the Notice. The Employer received no further correspondence to their protest until it received a Statement of Charges, at which time the Employer learned the agency did not receive its protest.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive - but not conclusive - evidence of the date of mailing. There is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and the Administrative Law Judge and this Board have no authority to change the decision of representative if a timely appeal is not filed. *Franklin v. Iowa Dept. Job Service*, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). The ten day period for appealing an initial determination concerning a claim for benefits has been described as jurisdictional. *Messina v. Iowa Dept. of Job Service*, 341 N.W.2d 52, 55 (Iowa 1983); *Beardslee v. Iowa Dept. Job Service*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979). The only basis for changing the ten-day period would be where notice to the appealing party was constitutionally invalid. *E.g. Beardslee v. Iowa Dept. Job Service*, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979). The question in such cases becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. *Hendren v. Iowa Employment Sec. Commission*, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); *Smith v. Iowa Employment Sec. Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471 (Iowa 1973). The question of whether the Employer has been denied a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal is also informed by rule 871-24.35(2) which states that "the submission of any ...appeal...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."

Here the evidence establishes that the protest was filed timely, but was lost through postal system. For this reason, we find the Employer's protest timely.

DECISION:

The administrative law judge's decision dated March 8, 2022 is **REVERSED & REMANDED** to an administrative law judge in the Workforce Development Center, Appeals Section. The administrative law judge shall issue a decision on the merits of this case. The Administrative Law Judge may in the Administrative Law Judge's discretion conduct an additional hearing if the judge deems it necessary to develop issues that were not adequately addressed in the first hearing because of the disposition of the issue of timeliness. After the hearing, if any, the administrative law judge shall issue a decision that provides the parties appeal rights.

James M. Strohman

Ashley R. Koopmans

Myron R. Linn

AMG/sh