

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

JOEY W RYMER

Claimant

MIDWEST DIVING SERVICES INC

Employer

APPEAL NO. 11A-UI-02592-PT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

**OC: 11/21/10
Claimant: Respondent (1R)**

Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

The employer appealed the representative's decision dated February 24, 2011, reference 02, that concluded it failed to file a timely protest regarding the claimant's separation of employment on November 23, 2010, and no disqualification of unemployment insurance benefits was imposed. A hearing was scheduled and held on March 24, 2011, pursuant to due notice. Claimant was called at the number provided for the hearing but he was not available. Employer participated by Terry Heck, Owner and Frank DicoLandrea, Supervisor.

ISSUE:

The issue in this matter is whether the employer's protest is timely.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant's notice of claim was mailed to the employer's address of record on November 23, 2010, and received by the employer within ten days. The notice of claim contains a warning that any protest must be postmarked or returned not later than ten days from the initial mailing date. The employer did not affect a protest until January 21, 2011, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

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.

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 protest regarding the separation from employment.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer failed to effect a timely protest within the time period prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security Law, and 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 24.35(2). The administrative law judge further concludes that the employer has failed to effect a timely protest 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 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).

The claimant returned to work for the employer on December 23, 2010 and worked until December 27, 2010. Additional work was available after that date but claimant failed to return to work and advised other employees that he no longer wanted to work. This is a second period of employment and second separation of employment which must be adjudicated. The employer has given timely notice of this separation so this issue is remanded.

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated February 24, 2011, reference 02, is affirmed. The employer has failed to file a timely protest, and the decision of the representative shall stand and remain in full force and effect. The issue of claimant's subsequent separation of employment on December 27, 2010 is remanded for determination.

Ron Pohlman
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

rrp/css