

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

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

**ZACHARY J ANDRESEN**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 13A-UI-11627-HT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**LA LEASING  
SEDONA STAFFING**  
Employer

**OC: 04/14/13  
Claimant: Respondent (2-R)**

Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest  
Section 96.6-2 – Timeliness of Appeal

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer, Sedona Staffing, filed an appeal from a decision dated July 30, 2013, reference 03. The decision found the employer's protest was not timely. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone conference call on November 7, 2013. The claimant did not provide a telephone number where he could be contacted and did not participate. The employer participated by Workers Compensation Administrator Chad Baker and Branch Manager Shelby Kingery.

**ISSUE:**

The issue is whether the appeal is timely and whether the employer's protest is timely.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

A decision finding the employer's protest was not timely was mailed to the employer's last-known address of record on July 30, 2013. The employer received the decision. The decision contained a warning that an appeal must be postmarked or received by the Appeals Section by August 9, 2013. The appeal was not filed until October 3, 2013, which is after the date noticed on the decision. The employer did fax a response to the decision on August 1, 2013, but it was not received by Iowa Workforce Development Appeals Bureau.

The employer has also received the notice of claim mailed April 19, 2013, and faxed a response on April 25, 2013, with confirmation of its receipt. Iowa Workforce Development did not receive that fax, either.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.6-2 provides in pertinent part:

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. . . . 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.

The ten calendar days for appeal begins running on the mailing date. The "decision date" found in the upper right-hand portion of the 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).

Pursuant to rules 871 IAC 26.2(96)(1) and 871 IAC 24.35(96)(1), appeals are considered filed when postmarked, if mailed. Messina v. IDJS, 341 N.W.2d 52 (Iowa 1983).

The record in this case shows that more than ten calendar days elapsed between the mailing date and the date this appeal was filed. 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 appellant did have a reasonable opportunity to file a timely appeal.

The administrative law judge concludes the employer did respond to both the notice of claim and the fact-finding decision in a timely manner. Through no fault of the employer the faxes were either not received or not processed.

**DECISION:**

The decision of the representative dated July 30, 2013, reference 03, is reversed. The appeal shall be accepted as timely and the response to the notice of claim shall also be accepted as timely.

The matter of the claimant separation from this employer is remanded to the Agency for determination.

---

Bonny G. Hendricksmeier  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

bgh/css