

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JAY P BARTHELME
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 18A-UI-02215-TNT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

PAN O GOLD BAKING CO
Employer

OC: 01/07/18
Claimant: Respondent (1)

Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Pan-O-Gold Baking Co. filed a timely appeal from a representative's decision dated February 5, 2018, reference 02, decision that allowed benefits to the claimant and found the employer's protest untimely. After due notice was provided, a telephone conference hearing was held on March 14, 2018. Claimant participated. The employer participated by Mr. Benjamin James Richards, Vice President of Sales.

ISSUE:

Whether the employer filed a timely protest as required by law.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: a notice of claim filed on Jay P. Barthelme was mailed to the employer's last known address of record on January 9, 2018 and received by the 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 of the initial mailing date. The employer did not effect a protest until January 25, 2018 which is after the ten day period had expired.

Although the notice of claim filed was received by the employer at its address of record allowing sufficient time for its completion and return by the employer, the protest was not returned timely because the company employee who normally handles official correspondence of this type was ill and absent from work for approximately one week. The employer had made no arrangements to have the duties of the absent employee completed by another worker during her absence or to have the notice of claim forwarded to a different worker. The employer has established no good cause reason for failing to file its protest within the statutory time limit.

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 protest regarding the separation from employment.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer failed to effect a timely protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law, and 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 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to effect a timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code section 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).

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated February 5, 2018, reference 02, 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 that Jay P. Barthelme satisfies all other conditions of eligibility.

Terry P. Nice
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

tn/scn