

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

SHAWNA C LIPPER
Claimant

APPEAL 18A-UI-03232-JP-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

STEVES ACE HARDWARE INC
Employer

**OC: 02/11/18
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the March 2, 2018, (reference 02) decision that found the protest untimely and allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on April 5, 2018. Claimant participated. The employer participated by president Sara Carpenter. Official notice was taken of the administrative record, including the notice of claim and the employer's protest, with no objection.

ISSUE:

Is the employer's protest timely?

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 February 13, 2018, and was received by employer within ten days. The notice of claim contained a warning that the employer protest response was due on February 23, 2018. Ms. Carpenter testified she filled it out on February 22, 2018. Ms. Carpenter testified she handed the employer's protest to a mail carrier at a street mailbox near the employer on February 22, 2018. The administrative record reflects the employer's protest response was postmarked February 24, 2018. The employer did not file a protest response until February 24, 2018.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

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 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 an unemployment insurance decision states that such an appeal must be filed within ten days after notification 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 setting 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. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(1) Except as otherwise provided by statute or by division rule, any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document submitted to the division shall be considered received by and filed with the division:

a. If transmitted via the United States Postal Service on the date it is mailed as shown by the postmark, or in the absence of a postmark the postage meter mark of the envelope in which it is received; or if not postmarked or postage meter marked or if the mark is illegible, on the date entered on the document as the date of completion.

b. If transmitted via the State Identification Data Exchange System (SIDES), maintained by the United States Department of Labor, on the date it was submitted to SIDES.

c. If transmitted by any means other than those outlined in paragraphs 24.35(1) "a" and "b," on the date it is received by the division.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2) provides:

Date of submission and extension of time for payments and notices.

(2) The submission of any payment, appeal, application, request, notice, objection, petition, report or other information or document not within the specified statutory or regulatory period shall be considered timely if it is established to the satisfaction of the division that the delay in submission was due to division error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service.

a. For submission that is not within the statutory or regulatory period to be considered timely, the interested party must submit a written explanation setting forth the circumstances of the delay.

b. The division shall designate personnel who are to decide whether an extension of time shall be granted.

c. No submission shall be considered timely if the delay in filing was unreasonable, as determined by the department after considering the circumstances in the case.

d. If submission is not considered timely, although the interested party contends that the delay was due to division error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United

States postal service, the division shall issue an appealable decision to the interested party.

The administrative record reflects that the employer's envelope was not postmarked until February 24, 2018. Pursuant to rule Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. *Messina v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). The postage meter mark on the last day for filing does not perfect a timely appeal if the postmark affixed by the United States Postal Service is beyond the filing date. *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. of Cedar Rapids v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990). The employer has not shown any good cause for failure to comply with the jurisdictional time limit. 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 March 2, 2018, (reference 02) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the unemployment insurance decision shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

Jeremy Peterson
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

jp/rvs