

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

MICHAEL J CROWELL
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 11A-UI-15310-ST

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

BESCH NUTRIENT APPLICATORS INC
Employer

**OC: 10/16/11
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.5-1 – Voluntary Quit
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed a department decision dated November 17, 2011, reference 02, that held claimant completed his job on November 9, 2010, and benefits are allowed. A telephone hearing was held on December 21, 2011. The claimant participated. David and Debra Besch, Owners, participated for the employer. Employer Exhibit One was received as evidence.

ISSUE:

Whether the employer filed a timely appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge having heard the testimony of the witnesses, and having considered the evidence in the record, finds: The department mailed the decision to the employer's address of record on November 17, 2011. The decision warns that an appeal must be filed by November 27 that is a Sunday. The appeal period is extended to the next working day November 28. The employer accounting firm faxed an appeal to the department on November 29. The reason for the delay was that the employer was busy and missed the deadline.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 provides in pertinent part:

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. . . . 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.

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).

(1) The record shows that the appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer failed to file a timely appeal. The employer failed to offer a good cause for the appeal delay.

DECISION:

The department decision dated November 17, 2011, reference 02, is affirmed. The employer failed to file a timely appeal, and the department decision that claimant completed his job on November 9, 2010 remains in force and affect. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Randy L. Stephenson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rls/pjs