

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**JAY ERTL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO: 14A-UI-03232-ET**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**KASTIM CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 01/19/14**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct  
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer/appellant appealed from the March 7, 2014, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on April 16, 2014. The claimant participated in the hearing. Chelsea Adams, General Manager and Terri Torres, Area Supervisor, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer. Department's Exhibit D-1, D-2 and D-3 were admitted to the record.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the claimant's (employer's) appeal is timely.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: A disqualification decision was mailed to the employer's last-known address of record on March 7, 2014. The employer received the decision. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by March 17, 2014. The appeal was not filed until March 24, 2014, which is after the date noticed on the disqualification decision. The employer attempted to appeal by fax March 17, 2014, but the confirmation report noted there was a "Comm Error" and states, "Fax Error Report," on the top of the document (Department's Exhibit D-3). The employer subsequently mailed an appeal postmarked March 24, 2014 (Department's Exhibit D-1).

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides:

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. The representative shall promptly

examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

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 evidence of the date of mailing. Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev., 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); Johnson v. Board of Adjustment, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. The Iowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal in a timely fashion. Hendren v. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal. While the employer attempted to fax its appeal March 17, 2014, the date it was due, the confirmation report clearly shows the appeal did not go through, as evidenced by the larger, bold font size indicating "Fax Report Error." The employer then waited until March 24, 2014, to mail a hard copy of its appeal as a "back up." If the employer truly believed its appeal was faxed successfully March 17, 2014, there would be no reason for it to send a second appeal. Additionally, the notice of appeal hearing was not mailed by the Appeals Bureau until March 27, 2014, and it would be highly unusual for a party to provide documents to the Appeals Bureau before it receives notice of the appeal date.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law 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 appeal was not timely filed 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 appeal. See, Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

**DECISION:**

The March 7, 2014, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

---

Julie Elder  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/css