

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

TIMOTHY SHINN
Claimant

APPEAL NO: 17A-UI-00132-JE-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

ABCM CORPORATION
Employer

OC: 12/04/16
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Iowa Code Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest
Iowa Code Section 96.5-2-a – Discharge/Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed a timely appeal from the December 27, 2016, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits and found the protest untimely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call before Administrative Law Judge Julie Elder on January 27, 2017. The claimant participated in the hearing with Attorney Don Juhl. Debra Johnson, Human Resources/Payroll Manager, participated in the hearing on behalf of the employer. Department's Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer's protest is timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on December 8, 2016, and received by the employer by at least December 12, 2016, which was within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked, faxed or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. That date landed on December 18, 2016. However, that was a Sunday so the appeal was due December 19, 2016. The employer did not file a protest until December 21, 2016, which is after the ten-day period had expired (Department's Exhibit D-1).

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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 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 that employer has failed to protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law. 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 4.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), and the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's separation from 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 December 27, 2016, reference 02, 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. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

Julie Elder
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

je/rvs