

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

BROOKE A JOHNSON
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 18A-UI-05249-B2T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

SHINING STARS CHILD DEVELOPMENT
Employer

OC: 04/08/18
Claimant: Respondent (2R)

Iowa Code § 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed the representative's decision dated May 2, 2018, reference 03, that concluded it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on November 11, 2017, and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. A hearing was scheduled and held on May 24, 2018, pursuant to due notice. Employer participated by Amanda Doyle. Claimant participated.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether the employer's protest is timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on April 16, 2018, and received by the employer within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer did not effect a protest until April 30, 2018, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

Employer stated that she has had ongoing issues with her mail and not receiving documents in a timely fashion. She stated that she checks her mail every day and did not receive the Notice of Claim until April 30, 2018. Employer stated that she filled out and returned her Protest on that date, knowing it was after the due date of April 26, 2018.

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, but the delay was due to an Agency error or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer is therefore deemed to have effected a timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6-2, and the administrative law judge will retain 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).

This matter shall be remanded to the fact finder for a determination on the separation issue.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated May 2, 2018, reference 03, is reversed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect. This matter is Remanded to the fact finder for a determination of the separation issue.

Blair A. Bennett
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

bab/scn