

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ANDREW J KING**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 10A-UI-05503-HT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**MANPOWER INC**  
Employer

**Original Claim: 11/01/09  
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer, Manpower, filed an appeal from a decision dated April 1, 2010, reference 04. The decision found the employer's protest was not timely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on May 28, 2010. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where he could be contacted and did not participate. The employer participated by Assistant Claims Manager Chris Code. Exhibit D-1 was admitted into the record.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the protest is timely.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Claimant's notice of claim was mailed to employer's address of record on November 4, 2009, and received by employer within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked, faxed, or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer responded November 16, 2009, stating this claimant had never been an employee.

Iowa Workforce Development sent notice to the employer of the wages paid to the claimant on February 25, 2010. The employer responded in a letter dated March 8, 2010, stating the claimant had voluntarily quit.

The Notice Of Claim specifically states on its face that "incomplete protest forms will be returned to the employer with no extension to the protest period."

**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.

The administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law. *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 4.35(2).* The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to timely protest pursuant to Iowa Code § 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 representative's decision dated April 1, 2010, reference 04, is affirmed. Employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.

---

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/kjw