

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

DARLA M HILL
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-02713-CT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**USA STAFFING INC – LABOR WORLD
OF IOWA**
Employer

**OC: 11/05/06 R: 01
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protests

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

USA Staffing, Inc. filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated March 15, 2007, reference 02, which held that the protest concerning Darla Hill's separation on December 19, 2005 was not timely filed. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone on April 2, 2007. The employer participated by Doug Conrad, Branch Manager. Ms. Hill did not respond to the notice of hearing.

ISSUE:

At issue in this matter is 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: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on November 9, 2006. 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 March 9, 2007, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

The employer has contended that there were approximately 28 notices of claims that were not received for claims filed during the fourth quarter of 2006. The employer contended that it did not receive four notices for claims filed during the third quarter of 2006. All of the notices were mailed to the employer's address of record in Windsor Heights, Iowa. The individual participating for the employer in the hearing works in the employer's Fort Dodge, Iowa, office.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Iowa Code section 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 employer alleged non-receipt of the notice concerning Ms. Hill's claim, as well as claims for other individuals. If three or four notices had not been received during a three-month period, the administrative law judge might find it likely they were lost in the mail. However, the administrative law judge is not inclined to believe that 28 separate notices mailed during the fourth quarter of 2006 were not received by the employer. The employer did not present evidence from anyone at the location to which the notices were sent. The administrative law judge 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 March 15, 2007, 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 Ms. Hill satisfies all other conditions of eligibility.

Carolyn F. Coleman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

cfc/css