IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS

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

RONALD K VINCENT

Claimant

APPEAL NO. 14A-UI-10082-JTT

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

WAHLE INC

Employer

OC: 08/24/14

Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the September 18, 2014, reference 03, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant provided he was otherwise eligible and that held the employer's account could be charged for benefits, based on an Agency conclusion that the employer's protest was untimely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on October 16, 2014. The claimant did not respond to the hearing notice and did not participate. Blu Wahle represented the employer and presented additional testimony through Angela Wahle. Exhibit One and Department Exhibit D-1 were received into evidence. The administrative law judge took official notice of the Agency's administrative record regarding wages earned by the claimant since his separation from the employer, which record indicates the claimant has earned 10 times his weekly benefit amount since the separation.

ISSUE:

Whether the employer's protest of the claim for benefits was timely. Whether there is good cause to deem the employer's late protest as timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On August 29, 2014, Iowa Workforce Development mailed a notice of claim concerning the above claimant to the employer's address of record. The notice of claim contained a warning that any protest must be postmarked, faxed or returned by the due date set forth on the notice, which was September 8, 2014. The notice of claim was received at the employer's address of in a timely manner, prior to the deadline for protest. The employer mailed its protest to Workforce Development. The employer's protest was postmarked September 11, 2014.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

- (1) Except as otherwise provided by statute or by department rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the department shall be considered received by and filed with the department:
- a. If transmitted via the United States postal service or its successor, on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.
- b. If transmitted by any means other than the United States postal service or its successor, on the date it is received by the department.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

- (2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the department that the delay in submission was due to department error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service or its successor.
- a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.
- b. The department shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.
- c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.

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.

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 lowa 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. <u>Beardslee v. IDJS</u>, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979). The administrative law judge considers the reasoning and holding of the court 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 had a reasonable opportunity to file a timely protest. The employer delayed filing the protest until after the protest deadline. The protest was filed on September 11, 2014, as indicated by the postmark date on the protest envelope. The employer's failure to file a protest by the September 8, 2014 deadline was not attributable to Workforce Development error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. Accordingly, the protest was untimely under lowa Code section 96.6(2) and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to disturb the Agency's initial determination regarding the nature of the claimant's separation from the employment, the claimant's eligibility for benefits, or the employer's liability for benefits and the employer's liability for benefits shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

DECISION:

jet/pjs

The Claims Deputy's September 18, 2014, reference 03, decision is affirmed. The agency's initial determination of the claimant's eligibility for benefits and the employer's liability for benefits shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

James E. Timberland
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed