

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

LISA CONKLING

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-00465-NT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

JKD ENTERPRISES INC

Employer

OC: 12/22/13

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

JKD Enterprises, Inc. filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated January 9, 2014, reference 04, which held that the protest concerning Lisa Conkling's separation on October 1, 2012 was not timely filed. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone on February 5, 2014. Although Ms. Conkling submitted a telephone number for the hearing she was not available at the telephone number provided. Two messages were left. The employer participated by Jeff Frost, Company Owner.

ISSUE:

At issue in this matter is whether the employer filed a timely protest as required by law.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on December 27, 2013, and received by the employer within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer did not effect a protest until January 7, 2014, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

The notice of claim filed was received at the employer's address of record but was not immediately completed because the employer was busy at that time. On the evening of January 6, 2014, Mr. Frost remembered that he had failed to complete the protest on Ms. Conkling's claim and had not forwarded the protest to Iowa Workforce Development. Mr. Frost completed the protest the following morning, January 7, 2014 and forwarded the protest to the Agency via facsimile. The protest was successfully received at that time.

It is the employer's position that the protest should not be considered as being untimely, based upon the employer's history of timely protesting in the past and because the form would have been further delayed had Mr. Frost deposited it with the U.S. Postal Service.

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 the employer failed to effect a timely protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law, and 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 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to effect a 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).

DECISION:

The January 9, 2014, reference 04, decision is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Terence P. Nice
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

css/css