

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

---

**DEANNA R GRAHAM**  
Claimant

**CALIKEYS LLC**  
Employer

**APPEAL 19A-UI-02338-SC-T**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 02/17/19**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

---

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Calikeys, LLC (employer) filed an appeal from the March 12, 2019, reference 03, unemployment insurance decision that found the protest untimely and allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on April 3, 2019. Deanna R. Graham (claimant) participated personally. The employer participated through General Manager Mark Casey. The Employer's Exhibit 1 was received.

**ISSUE:**

Is the employer's protest timely?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant separated from employment on May 11, 2018 and filed a claim for benefits effective February 17, 2019. The notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on February 22. The notice of claim contains a warning that the employer protest response is due ten days from the initial notice date and gave a response deadline of March 4.

The employer did not file a protest response until March 8, which is after the ten-day period had expired, because Casey and Office Manager Kelsey Casey, his wife, were out of town from February 25 through March 1; however, business continued in their absence. They returned to the office on March 4, but the protest was in a pile of mail that was awaiting their return as the policy is that only the General Manager and Office Manager can open the mail. Casey did not see the notice of claim until March 8.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to file protest response within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security 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.

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.

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's choice to hold the mail while the business operations continued during the Casey's' absence was a business decision. The employer has not established that the delay was due to any agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service pursuant to Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.35(2). As the employer has failed to timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6(2), the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the claimant's separation from employment. See, *Beardslee v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979); *Franklin v. Iowa Dep't of*

*Job Serv.*, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979) and *Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 465 N.W.2d 674 (Iowa Ct. App. 1990).

**DECISION:**

The March 12, 2019, reference 03, unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest response, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

---

Stephanie R. Callahan  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/scn