

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

KAREN DENNY
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 07A-UI-03990-BT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

CALERIS INC
Employer

**OC: 03/18/07 R: 04
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.6-2 - Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Caleris, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated April 9, 2007, reference 04, which held it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on January 12, 2007 and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on May 2, 2007. The claimant did not comply with the hearing notice instructions and did not call in to provide a telephone number at which she could be contacted and, therefore, did not participate. The employer participated through Marilyn Gilleland, Human Resources Manager. Kirstin Hill and Brenda Sterk were present for the hearing but did not provide evidence. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the party, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

ISSUE:

The issue is whether the employer's protest was timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and 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 March 22, 2007, and received by the employer's representative within ten days. The address of record was in care of Merit Resources and although Merit Resources was no longer handling the employer's account, no change of address had been filed with Iowa Workforce Development. 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 file its protest until April 5, 2007, which is after the ten-day period had expired. The decision allowing benefits was mailed to the same address as used on the Notice of Claim and the employer submitted its appeal to that decision in a timely manner.

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. It was the employer's responsibility to provide Iowa Workforce Development with an accurate address. Since this was not done, the address of record was a valid address at the time the Notice of Claim was mailed.

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 unemployment insurance decision dated April 9, 2007, reference 04, 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.

Susan D. Ackerman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

sda/css