

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

PRECIOUS D WILLIS
Claimant

HOTEL DEVELOPMENT INC
Employer

APPEAL 17A-UI-07095-JCT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 05/21/17
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer filed an appeal from the July 5, 2017, (reference 05) unemployment insurance decision that found the protest untimely and allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on July 28, 2017. The claimant participated. The employer participated by Thressy Jones, general manager. Department's Exhibit D-1 was received. The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative record, including the Notice of Claim and protest. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

Is the employer's protest 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 employer's address of record on May 31, 2017, and was received by employer within ten days. Ms. Jones herself received the claim on June 5, 2017. The notice of claim contains a warning that the employer protest response is due ten days from the initial notice date and gave a response deadline of June 12, 2017. The employer did not attempt to file a response to the claim until June 17, 2017, after the due date. When the employer attempted to fax it to three possible numbers, it was not received. The employer then resubmitted the protest via fax on June 22, 2017 and it was received (Department exhibit D-1). The employer did not make any attempts to file the appeal on or before June 12, 2017. The reason for delay in response is that Ms. Jones had to retrieve the claimant's records and was busy handling other business matters.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to protest response within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security 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.

Part of the same section of the unemployment insurance law deals with the timeliness of an appeal from a representative's decision and states an appeal must be filed within ten days after the date the decision was mailed to the parties. In addressing an issue of timeliness of an appeal, the Iowa Supreme Court concluded that when a statute creates a right to appeal and limits the time for appealing, compliance with the time limit is mandatory and jurisdictional. *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979).

This reasoning should also apply to the time limit for filing a protest after a notice of claim has been mailed to the employer. Based on the evidence presented, the employer failed to file a protest within the time period prescribed by Iowa Code Section § 96.6(2). The employer received the notice of claim within the prescribed period to reply but did not make any attempts until June 17, 2017, after the June 12, 2017 due date. The fact that the fax machine may not have been operable on June 17, 2017 is moot inasmuch as the employer did not make any attempts to file the claim protest within the prescribed period and therefore the delay in timely responding to the notice of claim, was not affected by a June 17, 2017 fax machine issue.

The administrative law judge is sympathetic to the employer, but based on the evidence presented, concludes that the employer's failure to file a timely protest was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service, which under 871 IAC 24.35(2) would excuse the delay in filing the protest. Since the protest was untimely, there is no jurisdiction to make a decision regarding the separation from employment. See *Beardslee v. IDJS*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979); *Franklin v. IDJS*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979). Therefore, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's separation from employment or authority to remand for a fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.6(2).

DECISION:

The July 5, 2017, (reference 05) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the unemployment insurance decision shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Jennifer L. Beckman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn