

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

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

MICHAEL D GROBIN
Claimant

APPEAL NO. 15A-UI-13995-TN-T

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION**

MEALHOW CONSTRUCTION LLC
Employer

**OC: 11/22/15
Claimant: Respondent (1)**

Section 96.6(2) – Timeliness of Protest

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Mealhow Construction LLC filed an appeal from a representative's decision dated December 14, 2015, reference 03, which held that the protest concerning Michael Grobin's separation on April 6, 2015 was not timely filed. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held by telephone on January 12, 2016. Ms. Ashley Mealhow, Office Manager participated. Although duly notified, the claimant did not participate.

ISSUE:

At issue in this matter is whether the employer filed a timely protest as required by law.

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 24, 2015, 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 effect a protest until December 9, 2015, which is after the ten-day period had expired.

Although the notice of claim filed was received at the employer's address of record within ten days from its initial mailing date, the employer did not respond because Ms. Mealhow, the office manager and Mr. Mealhow, the company owner, were out of town in the state of Texas. The employer had made no arrangements to have official correspondence forwarded or have anyone act in their behalf during their absence.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The administrative law judge concludes that the employer has failed to protest within the time limit prescribed by the Iowa Employment Security 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 appeal regarding the separation from employment.

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).

DECISION:

The decision of the representative dated December 14, 2015, reference 03, 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.

Terence P. Nice
Administrative Law Judge

Decision Dated and Mailed

css/css