

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

RUTH G HASVOLD  
1210 LOCUST RD  
DECORAH IA 52101

VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL  
ATTN OFFICE MANAGER  
40 – 1<sup>ST</sup> ST SE  
WAUKON IA 52172

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-01796-CT  
OC: 07/04/04 R: 04  
Claimant: Respondent (1)

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed the representative's decision dated July 28, 2004, reference 03, that concluded it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on July 3, 2003, and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. A telephone hearing was scheduled and held on March 8, 2005, pursuant to due notice. The employer participated by Erin Berns, Human Resources Director. Ms. Hasvold responded to the notice of hearing but was not available at the number provided at the scheduled time of the hearing. She did not contact the Appeals Section until approximately 11:15 a.m., after the hearing record was closed. She did not establish good cause for not participating at the scheduled time and, therefore, the administrative law judge declined to reopen the hearing record.

## 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 July 13, 2004, 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 July 26, 2004, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

The notice of Ms. Hasvold's claim was received by the employer on the same day as a claim for another former employee. The employer assumed that both were due the same day. The due date for a protest to Ms. Hasvold's claim is noted on the notice of claim as July 23, 2004.

## 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 protest 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).

There is an issue as to whether the employer appealed the July 28, 2004 decision holding the protest untimely. Even if the employer had filed a timely appeal, the fact remains that the underlying protest was not timely filed. Therefore, the administrative law judge still would not have jurisdiction over the separation issue.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated July 28, 2004, reference 03, 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. Benefits are allowed, provided Ms. Hasvold satisfies all other conditions of eligibility.

cfc/sc