

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section  
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI**

**JESSICA L GRIGGS  
610 W 4<sup>TH</sup> ST  
BVU BOX 3056  
STORM LAKE IA 50588**

**VILLAGE TAILS  
KAREN SCOTT  
301 VILLA RD  
ALTA IA 51002**

**Appeal Number: 05A-UI-12161-DT  
OC: 10/23/05 R: 01  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

**This Decision Shall Become Final**, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

---

(Administrative Law Judge)

---

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Karen Scott, doing business as Village Tails (employer), appealed a representative's November 23, 2005 decision (reference 01) that concluded Jessica L. Griggs (claimant) was qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits and the employer's account might be charged because the employer's protest was not timely filed. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on December 16, 2005. The claimant participated in the hearing. Karen Scott appeared on the employer's behalf. During the hearing, Exhibit A-1 was entered into evidence. Based on the evidence, the arguments of the parties, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision affirming the representative's decision and allowing the claimant benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The claimant established a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective October 23, 2005. A notice of claim was mailed to the employer's last-known address of record on October 28, 2005. The employer received the notice on or by November 1, 2005. The notice contained a warning that a protest must be postmarked or received by the Agency by November 7, 2005. The protest was not filed until it was faxed on November 9, 2005, which is after the date noticed on the notice of claim. The reason for the delay was that despite the due date specified on the notice, the employer thought she had ten business days, or she misread the form and thought it said "11/09/2005" instead of "11/07/2005" as the due date. Also, the employer works full time operating a salon, spends a significant amount of time caring for her mother, and her home was undergoing renovation. She decided not to mail it when she signed in on November 1 because she intended to fax it from her fax machine at the salon, which she did on November 9.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue in this matter is whether the employer filed a timely protest. The law provides that all interested parties shall be promptly notified about an individual filing a claim. The parties have ten days from the date of mailing the notice of claim to protest payment of benefits to the claimant. Iowa Code § 96.6-2. Another portion of Iowa Code § 96.6-2 dealing with timeliness of an appeal from a representative's decision states 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 has held that this statute clearly limits the time to do so, and 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 the Beardslee court controlling on the portion of Iowa Code § 96.6-2 which deals with the time limit to file a protest after the notice of claim has been mailed to the employer. Compliance with the protest provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. Beardslee, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), protests are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). The question in this case thus becomes whether the employer was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert a protest in a timely fashion. Hendren v. IESC, 217 N.W.2d 255 (Iowa 1974); Smith v. IESC, 212 N.W.2d 471, 472 (Iowa 1973). The record shows that the employer did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely protest.

871 IAC 24.35(2) provides in pertinent part:

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 department that the delay in submission was due to department error or misinformation or to delay or other action of the United States postal service or its successor.

The employer has not shown that the delay for not complying with the jurisdictional time limit was due to department error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. Misreading the information on the notice is not an excusable reason to extend the deadline; while the employer may have had good personal or business reasons not to send in the completed protest before November 9, this was a business decision for which the

employer, not the claimant, must bear the consequences. Since the employer filed the protest late without any legal excuse, the employer did not file a timely protest. Since the administrative law judge concludes that the protest was not timely filed pursuant to Iowa Code § 96.6-2, the administrative law judge lacks jurisdiction to make a determination with respect to the nature of the protest and the reasons for the claimant's separation from employment, regardless of the merits of the employer's protest. 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). The employer's account may be subject to charge, and will be subject to charge in the claimant's current benefit year if the employer is a base period employer of the claimant. Iowa Code § 96.7. The claimant's base period is July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. Iowa Code § 96.19-3.

DECISION:

The November 23, 2005 (reference 01) decision is affirmed. The protest in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative remains in effect. Benefits are allowed, provided the claimant is otherwise eligible.

ld/kjw