

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DONNA J DOES GORSCH
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 12A-UI-01206-S2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

HY-VEE INC
Employer

OC: 12/25/11
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed a timely appeal from the January 27, 2012, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits and found the protest untimely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on February 27, 2012. The claimant did not participate. The employer did participate through Julia Church, Claims Analyst. Department's Exhibits One and D-1 were received into evidence.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer filed a timely protest.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant's notice of claim was mailed to employer's address of record on January 3, 2012, and received by employer 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. It also contains a warning that the signature box must be completed. The employer used a computer generated signature and stamp to complete the signature box. No date was completed in the signature box indicating the date the signature was affixed. On January 13, 2012, the date the protest was due, employer recognized that the department's fax machine was busy. It was unable to transmit eleven other claims by 2:30 p.m. Employer talked to a person employed by the department about the problem. Knowing that faxes were not being transmitted, employer attempted to fax the notice of claim in this case at 3:47 p.m., 4:07 p.m. and 4:15 p.m. These attempts were unsuccessful. Employer did not mail the notice of claim. Instead employer faxed the notice of claim on January 16, 2012, which is after the ten-day period had expired. No good cause reason has been established for the delay.

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 § 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 because it insisted on faxing rather than mailing. *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 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).

The protest contains the following warning. "The protest information you provide below must be CERTIFIED CORRECT BY SIGNING AND COMPLETING THE SIGNATURE BOX. Incomplete protest forms will be returned to the employer with no extension to the protest period." The employer did not complete the date section inside the Signature Box.

DECISION:

The January 25, 2012, reference 02, decision is affirmed. Employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Beth A. Scheetz
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bas/css