

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**DRU A SNYDER**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 11A-EUCU-00774-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**MIDWESTERN TRADING INC**  
**RICK STICKLE**  
Employer

**OC: 08/31/08**  
**Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code Section 96.5(2)(a) - Discharge  
Iowa Code Section 96.6(2) - Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed an appeal from the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits in connection with the October 28, 2010 separation. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on November 9, 2011. Claimant Dru Snyder provided a telephone number for the hearing, answered his telephone at the time of the hearing, but then disconnected and failed to make himself available for the hearing. Rick Stickle, President and owner, represented the employer. The hearing in this matter was consolidated with the hearing in appeal number 11A-UI-13705-JTT. Exhibit One and Department Exhibit D-1 were received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the employer's appeal from the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision can be deemed a timely appeal. It cannot.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: On January 25, 2011, Iowa Workforce Development mailed a copy of the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision to the employer's last-known address of record. The employer received the decision in a timely manner, prior to the deadline for appeal. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by February 4, 2011. The employer did not file an appeal in response to the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision.

Claimant Dru Snyder subsequently established a new "original claim" for benefits that was effective September 18, 2011. On October 12, 2011, Workforce Development mailed a copy of the October 12, 2011, reference 02, decision to the employer's address of record. The decision allowed benefits based on an Agency determination that the October 28, 2010 separation had previously adjudicated and that the adjudication remained in effect. The October 12, 2011 decision carried an October 22, 2011 deadline for appeal. On October 15, 2011, the employer

drafted and mailed an appeal from the October 12, 2011, reference 02, decision. The mailed appeal carries a postage meter mark dated October 15, 2011. The Appeals Section received the appeal on October 18, 2011 and treated it as also an appeal from the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision.

## **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides:

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 representative shall promptly examine the claim and any protest, take the initiative to ascertain relevant information concerning the claim, and, on the basis of the facts found by the representative, shall determine whether or not the claim is valid, the week with respect to which benefits shall commence, the weekly benefit amount payable and its maximum duration, and whether any disqualification shall be imposed. The claimant has the burden of proving that the claimant meets the basic eligibility conditions of section 96.4. The employer has the burden of proving that the claimant is disqualified for benefits pursuant to section 96.5, except as provided by this subsection. The claimant has the initial burden to produce evidence showing that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 10, and has the burden of proving that a voluntary quit pursuant to section 96.5, subsection 1, was for good cause attributable to the employer and that the claimant is not disqualified for benefits in cases involving section 96.5, subsection 1, paragraphs "a" through "h". Unless the claimant or other interested party, after notification or within ten calendar days after notification was mailed to the claimant's last known address, files an appeal from the decision, the decision is final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance with the decision. If an administrative law judge affirms a decision of the representative, or the appeal board affirms a decision of the administrative law judge allowing benefits, the benefits shall be paid regardless of any appeal which is thereafter taken, but if the decision is finally reversed, no employer's account shall be charged with benefits so paid and this relief from charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

The ten-day deadline for appeal begins to run on the date Workforce Development mails the decision to the parties. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the Agency representative's decision, unless otherwise corrected immediately below that entry, is presumptive evidence of the date of mailing. Gaskins v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev., 429 A.2d 138 (Pa. Comm. 1981); Johnson v. Board of Adjustment, 239 N.W.2d 873, 92 A.L.R.3d 304 (Iowa 1976).

An appeal submitted by mail is deemed filed 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 was 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. See 871 AC 24.35(1)(a). See also Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983). An appeal submitted by any other means is deemed filed on the date it is received by the Unemployment Insurance Division of Iowa Workforce Development. See 871 IAC 24.35(1)(b).

The appeal at issue in this matter was filed on October 15, 2011, the date of the postage meter mark.

The evidence in the record establishes that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date of the January 25 2011, reference 01, decision and the date this appeal was filed. Indeed, more than eight months had transpired between the two events. The Iowa Supreme Court has declared that there is a mandatory duty to file appeals from representatives' decisions within the time allotted by statute, and that the administrative law judge has no authority to change the decision of a representative if a timely appeal is not filed. Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877, 881 (Iowa 1979). Compliance with appeal notice provisions is jurisdictional unless the facts of a case show that the notice was invalid. Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373, 377 (Iowa 1979); see also In re Appeal of Elliott, 319 N.W.2d 244, 247 (Iowa 1982). The question in this case thus becomes whether the appellant was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to assert an appeal 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/appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal from the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision, but did not do so.

The administrative law judge concludes that failure to file a timely appeal from the January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision within the time prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law was not due to any Agency error or misinformation or delay or other action of the United States Postal Service. See 871 IAC 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the appeal was not timely filed 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 appeal. See, Beardslee v. IDJS, 276 N.W.2d 373 (Iowa 1979) and Franklin v. IDJS, 277 N.W.2d 877 (Iowa 1979).

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's January 25, 2011, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The appeal in this case was not timely, and the decision of the representative that allowed benefits, provided the claimant was otherwise eligible, remains in effect.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/css