#### IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

LORA C FRUEH Claimant

# APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-01216-LT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

## **CIGARETTE OUTLET INC**

Employer

OC: 01/06/08 R: 03 Claimant: Respondent (4)

Iowa Code Chapter 95 – Requalification Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest Iowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the January 25, 2008, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits and found the protest untimely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on February 19, 2008. The claimant did respond but opted not to participate since she had requalified for benefits. The employer participated through Debra Schnyder. Department's Exhibits D-1 and D-2 were received.

### ISSUE:

The issue is whether employer's appeal and protest are timely.

### FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The decision was mailed to the employer at 427 Pershing Ave #120 Davenport, Iowa 50801 on January 25, 2008 even after employer had requested in the protest (Department's Exhibit D-2) that all future correspondence be directed to its new address at 2208 E. 11th St Davenport, Iowa 50803. Because the agency used an old address, the employer did not receive the decision until February 5, 2008, the day after the appeal deadline. The appeal was sent immediately upon receipt of the decision. The employer had requested the address change in writing in late December 2007 when all other business address change requests were made. In spite of this request, the claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's old address on January 10, 2008 and received on January 23, 2008, the day after the protest deadline. The employer filed its protest on January 23, 2008. The claimant has requalified for benefits since the separation from the employer.

### REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The first issue to be considered in this appeal is whether the employer's appeal is timely. The administrative law judge determines it is.

lowa Code § 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 disgualification 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 disgualified 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 disgualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary guit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disgualified 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 employer did not have an opportunity to appeal the fact-finder's decision because the decision was not received prior to the appeal deadline. Without notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The employer filed its appeal immediately upon receipt of the adverse decision. Therefore, the appeal shall be accepted as timely.

Iowa Code § 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.

The employer did not have an opportunity to protest the notice of claim by the due date because the notice was not received in a timely fashion. Without timely notice of a disqualification, no meaningful opportunity for appeal exists. See *Smith v. Iowa Employment Security Commission*, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The employer filed the protest the same day of receipt of the notice of claim. Therefore, the protest shall be accepted as timely.

The administrative law judge further concludes that the claimant has requalified for benefits since the separation from this employer. Accordingly, benefits are allowed and the account of the employer shall not be charged.

#### **DECISION:**

The January 25, 2008, reference 01, decision is modified in favor of the appellant. The employer has filed a timely appeal and protest, and the claimant has requalified for benefits since the separation. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible. The account of the employer shall not be charged.

Dévon M. Lewis Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

dml/pjs