

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

SHAW REH
Claimant

SWIFT PORK COMPANY
Employer

**APPEAL 21A-UI-18020-ED-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 04/26/20
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Iowa Code § 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed an appeal from the July 14, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that found benefits were denied. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on October 4, 2021. The claimant participated personally. Interpretation services were provided by Language Link. The employer did not participate. No exhibits were offered or admitted.

ISSUE:

Is the claimant's appeal timely?

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: the notice of decision was mailed to the claimant on July 14, 2020, and was received by employer within ten days. The notice of decision contains a warning that the claimant's appeal is due ten days from the initial notice date and gave a response deadline of July 24, 2020. The form advises any appeal must be postmarked, faxed or returned not later than ten days from July 14, 2020. The claimant did not file an appeal until August 16, 2021, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge concludes that employer has failed to 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.


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. Therefore, the administrative law judge is without jurisdiction to entertain any appeal regarding the separation from employment.

The delay was not 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). No other good cause reason has been established for the delay. The administrative law judge further concludes that the claimant 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. 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 July 14, 2020, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant has failed to file a timely appeal, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect.



Emily Drenkow Carr
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

October 5, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

ed/mh