

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2019-EAB-0696

Affirmed
Ineligible Weeks 13-19 through 20-19
Overpayment and Penalties Assessed – Weeks 06-19 through 20-19

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On May 30, 2019, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding claimant was not eligible for benefits from March 24, 2019 through May 18, 2019 (weeks 13-19 through 20-19) because he was not unemployed during those weeks (decision # 161216). On May 31, 2019, the Department served notice of another administrative decision, based in part on decision # 161216, assessing a \$4,190 overpayment, a \$1,257 monetary penalty, and a 27-week penalty disqualification from benefits (decision # 193958).

On June 17, 2019, claimant filed requests for hearing on decisions # 161216 and # 193958 with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). On July 5, 2019, ALJ Scott conducted a hearing on decision # 161216, at which the employer failed to appear, and on July 11, 2019, issued Order No. 19-UI-132898, affirming the Department's decision. On July 5, 2019, ALJ Scott conducted a separate hearing on decision # 193958, and on July 11, 2019, issued Order No. 19-UI-133177, affirming the Department's decision.

On July 29, 2019, claimant filed applications for review of Order Nos. 19-UI-132898 and 19-UI-133177 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB). Pursuant to OAR 471-041-0095 (October 29, 2006), EAB consolidated its review of Order Nos. 19-UI-132898 and 19-UI-133177. For case-tracking purposes, this decision is being issued in duplicate (EAB Decisions 2019-EAB-0696 and 2019-EAB-0697, respectively).

Written Argument. Written argument was due on August 21, 2019, if the parties chose to submit written argument. On August 29, 2019, claimant requested, by email, an extension of time to file a written argument regarding his applications for review of Order Nos. 19-UI-132898 and 19-UI-133177. Claimant asserted in his email request, "I'm requesting an extension of one week to present my arguments that pertain to the orders under review stated above. I will have the written statements to you by 9/03/2019. We were on vacation helping my in-laws transition to an assisted living facility when the notification was sent to us and didn't see our mail until 8/15/2019 so we didn't have the full twenty days

to seek council and formulate our thoughts and position.” Claimant’s Request for Extension of Written Argument.

EAB denied claimant’s request for an extension of time to file a written argument regarding each order for the following reasons:

Under OAR 471-041-0080(4)(a)(B) (May 13, 2019), EAB may grant an extension of time to submit written argument if, among other reasons, “the request is promptly made after the party becomes aware of the need for the extension.” Here, the request was not made promptly after claimant became aware of the need for the extension. Claimant reported that he “didn’t see” EAB’s August 1, 2019 acknowledgement letter until August 15, 2019, and 14 days passed before claimant sent his email request for an extension on August 29, 2019.

Under OAR 471-041-0080(4)(a)(E), EAB may grant an extension of time to submit written argument provided “the total period, including all extensions, [does] not exceed 35 days.” If EAB allowed claimant’s request and extended the deadline until September 3, 2019, as claimant requested, the total period would exceed 35 days and therefore violate the rule.

Under OAR 471-041-0080(4)(a)(D), good cause for extending the period of time within which to submit written argument must be shown, and good cause exists when “the circumstances necessitating the extension are beyond the reasonable control of the requesting party.” Here, claimant did not show that the circumstances necessitating extension were beyond his reasonable control. If claimant received the acknowledgment letter on August 15, 2019, it was within his reasonable control to act sooner and perhaps submit his argument by the deadline, or at least request an extension before the deadline expired.

Under OAR 471-041-0080(4)(b)(B), “failure to allow the extension [must] result in undue hardship to the requesting party.” Claimant did not show that denying the extensions would result in “undue hardship” to him. Although claimant explained that he had “pertinent information,” he failed to show that not allowing him to submit it would cause him undue hardship.

Finally, under OAR 471-041-0080(1), “Parties may submit written argument within 20 days of the date that EAB provides the notice required by OAR 471-041-0075.” Although claimant asserted that he “didn’t have the full twenty days to seek council and formulate our thoughts and position,” the rule only provides that all parties have 20 days from the date of the acknowledgment letter to submit an argument. Parties are not entitled to 20 days to “seek council and formulate [their] thoughts,” just 20 days from the date of the acknowledgment letter. For that reason, principles of equity or due process do not require that claimant be granted an extension.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On December 17, 2018, claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits. On December 17, claimant was working “full-time,” 40 hours per week, on a commission-only basis, as a mortgage loan officer for a mortgage banker, Finance of America (FOA). Audio Record, 2019-UI-97008, at 32:50 to 33:45. Claimant was uncertain whether he qualified for unemployment benefits because his commissions were sporadic and paid only when a mortgage transaction closed. He went to the WorkSource Oregon office in Oregon City, Oregon, and explained his

situation to an employee there, who encouraged him to file an initial claim for benefits. The Department determined that claimant had earned sufficient base year wages so that claimant's initial claim for benefits was monetarily valid with a weekly benefit amount of \$624. The maximum weekly benefit amount in effect at the time claimant filed his initial claim was \$624.

(2) On or about January 31, 2019, claimant quit his job with FOA. However, on February 4, 2019, Guaranteed Rate Inc. (GRI), also a mortgage banker, hired claimant to work as a mortgage originator on a full-time basis. When claimant was hired by GRI, he signed a contract that required claimant to work "full time" during each week. Exhibit 1, UI State Inquiry to GRI, May 15, 2019 Response, at 2. Claimant worked "at least" 40 hours per week each week he worked for GRI. Audio Record, 2019-UI-97008, at 18:45 to 19:15. The contract also required GRI to pay claimant a \$450 "non-recoverable draw" each week he worked for GRI until March 26, 2019. Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 19-20. Thereafter, GRI paid claimant a "non-recoverable draw" of \$450 each week from February 3 through March 23, 2019 (weeks 06-19 through 12-19). Exhibit 1, UI State Inquiry to GRI, May 13, 2019 Response, at 4.

(3) Claimant filed a weekly claim for benefits for each of the weeks including February 3, 2019 through May 18, 2019 (weeks 06-19 through 20-19), the weeks at issue. When filing his claims for each of those weeks, claimant certified to the Department that he had worked no hours and received no earnings during the week claimed. He also certified to the Department that his reports were true and accurate. When claimant certified to the Department that he had worked no hours during each of the weeks claimed, claimant knew that he had worked full-time during each of those weeks, "understood that [his] answers weren't accurate," and that no Department employee had advised him to deny he had worked during a week. Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 33, 37. Nonetheless, claimant certified to the Department that he had worked no hours during each of the weeks claimed as a "workaround" in order to obtain benefits. Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 38. When claimant certified to the Department that he had no earnings during each of the weeks from 06-19 through 12-19, although he knew he had received \$450 each week from GRI, claimant was uncertain if his "non-recoverable draws" were "earnings." Claimant did not contact the Department for answers to any questions he may have had regarding reporting earnings during those weeks. Exhibit 1, New Hire Transcript, Claimant Response, at 1. Based upon claimant's certifications that his reports were true and accurate, the Department paid claimant his full weekly benefit amount of \$624 for each of the weeks 06-19 through 16-19. The Department did not pay claimant any benefits for weeks 17-19 through 20-19.

(4) In April 2019, the Department received information that GRI had hired claimant on February 4, 2019. The Department began an investigation. On April 16, 2019, the Department sent claimant a five-day letter requesting that he respond to its request for further information including what his weekly hours and earnings had been since he was employed by GRI. On April 22, 2019, claimant replied, stating that he had "been getting paid as a draw," but "not sure how much." Exhibit 1, New Hire Transcript, Claimant Response, at 1. He gave no response regarding his weekly hours. The Department also sent GRI a similar request for information concerning claimant's hours and earnings. On or about May 13, 2019, GRI responded that claimant had been hired on February 4, 2019, to a "full time position in which [he was] required to work 40 hours per week," and that he had been paid \$450 per week for each of the weeks from February 3 to March 23, 2019. Exhibit 1, UI State Inquiry to GRI, May 15, 2019 Response, at 2; Exhibit 1, UI State Inquiry to GRI, May 13, 2019 Response, at 2.

(5) Based on claimant's false certifications to the Department about his work hours and earnings during the weeks at issue, the Department overpaid claimant \$242 in benefits for each of the weeks 06-19 through 12-19, and \$624 in benefits for each of the weeks 13-19 through 16-19, or a total of \$4,190 in regular benefits claimant that he was not entitled to receive.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant worked full-time during each of the weeks from March 24 through May 18, 2019 (weeks 13-19 through 20-19), and for that reason, is ineligible for benefits for those weeks. Claimant was overpaid benefits for the weeks from February 3 through April 20, 2019 in the amount of \$4,190, which he is liable to repay to the Department or have deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to him. Claimant also is assessed a monetary penalty in the amount of \$1,257 and a penalty disqualification from future benefits otherwise payable to him of 27 weeks because he willfully failed to report a material fact, that he was working full-time during each of weeks 06-19 through 20-19, to obtain benefits.

Eligibility for Benefits. Only "unemployed" individuals are eligible for benefits. ORS 657.150(1). For the purposes of ORS 657.155 (1), an individual who performs "full-time" services in any week for an employing unit is not unemployed even though remuneration is neither paid nor payable to the individual for the services performed. ORS 657.100(2). Where the Department has paid benefits, it has the burden to prove benefits should not have been paid. *Nichols v. Employment Division*, 24 Or App 195, 544 P2d 1068 (1976). By logical extension of that principal, where benefits have not been paid, a claimant has the burden to prove that the Department should have paid benefits.

In Decision # 161216, the Department concluded, after it initially paid claimant benefits for weeks 13-19 through 16-19, that claimant was ineligible to receive benefits for weeks 13-19 through 20-19 because he had worked full-time during each of those weeks for GRI. At hearing, the Department provided documentary evidence from the employer that claimant was contractually required to work 40 hours each week he was employed. Claimant also admitted that he had worked "full-time," "at least 40 hours," during each of the weeks from March 24 through May 18, 2019 (weeks 13-19 through 20-19). Accordingly, claimant did not dispute that he worked "full-time" and therefore was not "unemployed" during the weeks from March 24 through May 18, 2019, and for that reason, is ineligible for benefits for those weeks under ORS 657.100(2).

However, at hearing, claimant asserted that he was not at fault for reporting that he had worked no hours during each of the weeks 13-19 through 20-19 because when he filed his initial claim on December 17, 2018, he was misled by a WorkSource Oregon employee into believing that he was eligible for weekly benefits given his circumstances. He asserted that on that date, he fully explained to that employee that he was a commission-only employee who was working and paid only when he closed a sale, and that after doing so, the employee encouraged him to file a claim for benefits, which the Department later determined to be valid. Audio Record, 2019-UI-97008, at 21:30 to 24:30; 34:00 to 36:00. Claimant essentially asserted that the Department should be estopped from denying him benefits because he had tried to be "transparent" with the Department on the day he filed his original claim for benefits, but was misled by the Department employee. *Id.*

Under the doctrine of equitable estoppel, the Department would be barred from denying claimant's benefit claims on the theory that doing so would amount to penalizing claimant if that claimant reasonably relied upon bad advice from a Department employee. However, the doctrine of equitable

estoppel “requires proof of a false representation, (1) of which the other party was ignorant, (2) made with the knowledge of the facts, (3) made with the intention that it would induce action by the other party, and (4) that induced the other party to act upon it.” *Keppinger v. Hanson Crushing, Inc.*, 161 Or App 424, 428, 983 P2d 1084 (1999) (citation omitted). In addition, to establish estoppel against a state agency, a party “must have relied on the agency’s representations and the party’s reliance must have been reasonable.” *State ex rel SOSOC v. Dennis*, 173 Or App 604, 611, 25 P3d 341, *rev den*, 332 Or 448 (2001) (citing *Dept. of Transportation v. Hewett Professional Group*, 321 Or 118, 126, 895 P2d 755 (1995)).

Estoppel does not apply in this case for at least two reasons. More likely than not, any representation made by the WorkSource Oregon employee in question was not “false.” Even though claimant reportedly fully described the circumstances of his employment to the employee at the time of his initial claim for benefits, he admitted he only was told that he “should pursue” filing an initial claim for benefits, not that he would be eligible for benefits each week, which depended upon his answers to the weekly claims questions. Audio Record, 2019-UI-97008, at 34:10 to 35:25. Telling a prospective claimant that he should “pursue” filing an initial claim, particularly where it probably appeared the claimant in question had sufficient base year wages to qualify, would not be a false representation.

Second, claimant’s apparent reliance on an employee’s encouragement to file an initial claim and the Department’s later determination that the claim was monetarily valid to mean he should report whatever was necessary to be eligible for benefits on a weekly basis was not reasonable. Claimant asserted that he understood from his initial claim approval by the Department, after explaining his work situation to an employee who encouraged him to file it, that “what [he] had to attest to” on a weekly basis to qualify for benefits “was just a workaround” because “there was no correct pathway” for his exact work situation. Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 38. Claimant’s apparent rationale for his subsequent conduct in falsely reporting his work hours to the Department on a weekly basis was not reasonable on its face particularly when he admitted that he understood that his answers to the Department’s weekly claims questions “weren’t accurate.” Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 37. Because claimant did not establish that a representation reportedly made by the WorkSource Oregon employee to him was either false or reasonably relied upon by him, the Department may not be estopped from denying claimant benefits based on the alleged misleading statement.

Because claimant was not “unemployed” during the weeks from March 24 through May 18, 2019, he is ineligible for benefits for those weeks under ORS 657.100(2).

Overpayment. ORS 657.155(1) provides that only “unemployed” individuals may receive benefits. ORS 657.100(1) provides that an individual is deemed “unemployed” in any week if, among other things, the amount that the individual earned from work during that week is less than the individual’s weekly benefit amount. An eligible individual who has employment in any week claimed shall have his weekly benefit amount reduced by the amount of earnings paid or payable that exceeds the greater of ten times the Oregon minimum hourly wage or one-third of his weekly benefit amount. ORS 657.150(1).

ORS 657.310(1) provides that an individual who received benefits to which the individual was not entitled is liable to either repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to the individual under ORS chapter 657. That provision applies if the benefits were received because the individual made or caused to be made a false statement or

misrepresentation of a material fact, or failed to disclose a material fact, regardless of the individual's knowledge or intent. *Id.*

Claimant did not dispute that he received \$450 “non-recoverable draws” during each of the weeks 06-19 through 12-19, nor that when he filed each of his weekly claims for benefits for weeks 06-19 through 20-19, he certified to the Department that he had worked no hours and had no earnings. Because claimant had \$450 in earnings during weeks 06-19 through 12-19, he was not eligible to receive his full weekly benefit amount of \$624 but instead, based on the available information, only was eligible to receive \$382 in benefits for each of those weeks. ($\$450 - 1/3 \text{ WBA of } \$624 (\$208) = \242 ; $\$624 - 242 = \382). Nor was claimant eligible to receive his weekly benefit amount of \$624 for each of the weeks 13-19 through 16-19 when he received no draw from GRI because he worked full-time during each of those weeks, was not “unemployed,” and therefore was ineligible for any benefits. The Department would not have overpaid claimant \$4,190 in total benefits during the weeks at issue had claimant accurately reported that he had the earnings in question and had worked full-time during weeks 06-19 through 20-19. Regardless of claimant's knowledge or intent, he received \$4,190 in benefits to which he was not entitled because the hours and earnings information he provided to the Department were false statements of material facts. Claimant therefore is liable to repay the \$4,190 he received to the Department or to have that amount deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to him.

Misrepresentation. ORS 657.215 and ORS 657.310(2), read together, provide that if an individual has received any benefits to which the individual is not entitled because the individual has willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation or willfully failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits, the individual is liable to pay a monetary penalty and to have a penalty period of benefit disqualification imposed.

As discussed above, claimant asserted that he understood from his initial claim approval, after explaining his work situation to an employee who encouraged him to file it, that “what [he] had to attest to” on a weekly basis to qualify for benefits “was just a workaround” because “there was no correct pathway” for his exact work situation. Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 37-38. Claimant's apparent rationale for falsely reporting his work hours on a weekly basis was not reasonable on its face particularly when he admitted that he understood that his answers to the Department's weekly claims questions “weren't accurate.” Transcript, 2019-UI-97011, at 37. Because claimant did not have any reasonable justification or confusion about affirmatively reporting to the Department each week that he had not worked, when he knew he had worked full-time, and he knew that he was omitting information the Department was requesting as a “workaround,” it can be reasonably inferred that claimant thought if he reported his actual work hours it would negatively affect his ability to receive benefits. More likely than not, claimant's omission to truthfully report the material fact that he worked full-time each week during weeks 06-19 through 20-19 was willful and for the purpose of obtaining benefits. Accordingly, claimant is liable for misrepresentation penalties.

Penalties. ORS 657.310(2) provides that a monetary penalty for willful misrepresentations to obtain benefits shall be between 15 and 30 percent of the benefits the individual received to which the individual was not entitled. OAR 471-030-0052(7) (January 11, 2018) specifies that the monetary penalty assessed for a willful misrepresentation that is made to obtain benefits is a function of the number of occurrences of misrepresentation. An “occurrence” is counted as having occurred each time the individual willfully made a misrepresentation of obtain benefits. OAR 471-030-0052(7).

Here, there are at least fifteen weeks, each of weeks 06-19 through 20-19, for which claimant willfully failed to report that he had worked full-time, instead of reporting and certifying as true that during each of those weeks he had worked no hours. OAR 471-030-0052(7)(d) states that for the seventh or greater occurrence of misrepresentation within a five year period, the penalty to be assessed is 30 percent of the total amount of the benefits the individual received to which the individual was not entitled. Thirty percent of the \$4,190 in benefits that claimant received to which he was not entitled is \$1,257. Accordingly, claimant is assessed a monetary penalty of \$1,257.

ORS 657.215 provides that an individual who willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits, also may be disqualified from receiving future benefits for a period not to exceed 52 weeks. OAR 471-030-0052(1)(a) sets out the formula for calculating the weeks of penalty disqualification if the individual willfully failed to report work or earnings to receive benefits. “When the disqualification is imposed because the individual failed to accurately report work and/or earnings, the number of weeks of disqualification shall be determined by dividing the total amount of benefits overpaid to the individual for the disqualifying act(s), by the maximum Oregon weekly benefit amount in effect during the first effective week of the initial claim in effect at the time of the individual’s disqualifying act(s), rounding off to the nearest two decimal places, multiplying the result by four rounding it up to the nearest whole number.” *Id.*

Applying the formula to this case, the total amount of benefits overpaid to claimant based upon his failure to report the material fact that he had worked full-time during each of the weeks at issue (\$4,190) shall be divided by the maximum weekly benefit amount in effect during the first effective week of the initial claim in effect at the time of the disqualifying act (\$624), which equals 6.714, which rounded off to two decimal places equals 6.71, multiplying that result by 4 which equals 26.84, and rounding that number up to the nearest whole number, which equals 27, results in 27 weeks. Claimant is assessed 27 penalty weeks of disqualification from future benefits.

Conclusion. Claimant is ineligible for benefits for the weeks from March 24 through May 18, 2019 (weeks 13-19 through 20-19), because he was not “unemployed” during those weeks under ORS 657.100(2). Claimant is required to repay the Department, by deduction from future benefits or otherwise, a total of \$5,447 (\$4,190 - overpayment + \$1,257 - penalty). Claimant is also assessed 27 weeks of penalty disqualification from future benefits to which he otherwise may be entitled.

DECISION: Order Nos. 19-UI-132898 and 19-UI-133177 are affirmed.

J. S. Cromwell and S. Alba;
D. P. Hettle, not participating, recused.

DATE of Service: September 5, 2019

NOTE: You may appeal this decision by filing a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals within 30 days of the date of service listed above. *See* ORS 657.282. For forms and information, you may write to the Oregon Court of Appeals, Records Section, 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97310 or visit the Court of Appeals website at courts.oregon.gov. Once on the website, use the

'search' function to search for 'petition for judicial review employment appeals board'. A link to the forms and information will be among the search results.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/5WQXNJH>. If you are unable to complete the survey online and wish to have a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Traditional Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Tagalog

Paalala – Nakakaapekto ang desisyong ito sa iyong mga benepisyo sa pagkawala ng trabaho. Kung hindi mo naiintindihan ang desisyong ito, makipag-ugnayan kaagad sa Lupon ng mga Apela sa Trabaho (Employment Appeals Board). Kung hindi ka sumasang-ayon sa desisyong ito, maaari kang maghain ng isang Petisyon sa Pagsusuri ng Hukuman (Petition for Judicial Review) sa Hukuman sa Paghahabol (Court of Appeals) ng Oregon na sinusunod ang mga tagubilin na nakasulat sa dulo ng desisyong ito.

Vietnamese

Chú ý - Quyết định này ảnh hưởng đến trợ cấp thất nghiệp của quý vị. Nếu quý vị không hiểu quyết định này, hãy liên lạc với Ban Kháng Cáo Việc Làm ngay lập tức. Nếu quý vị không đồng ý với quyết định này, quý vị có thể nộp Đơn Xin Tái Xét Tư Pháp với Tòa Kháng Cáo Oregon theo các hướng dẫn được viết ra ở cuối quyết định này.

Spanish

Atención – Esta decisión afecta sus beneficios de desempleo. Si no entiende esta decisión, comuníquese inmediatamente con la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo. Si no está de acuerdo con esta decisión, puede presentar una Aplicación de Revisión Judicial ante el Tribunal de Apelaciones de Oregon siguiendo las instrucciones escritas al final de la decisión.

Russian

Внимание – Данное решение влияет на ваше пособие по безработице. Если решение Вам непонятно – немедленно обратитесь в Апелляционный Комитет по Трудоустройству. Если Вы не согласны с принятым решением, вы можете подать Ходатайство о Пересмотре Судебного Решения в Апелляционный Суд штата Орегон, следуя инструкциям, описанным в конце решения.

Khmer

ចំណុចសំខាន់ – សេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះមានផលប៉ះពាល់ដល់អត្ថប្រយោជន៍គ្មានការងារធ្វើរបស់លោកអ្នក។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់អំពីសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ សូមទាក់ទងគណៈកម្មការឧទ្ធរណ៍ការងារភ្លាមៗ។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់ស្របចំពោះសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះទេ លោកអ្នកអាចដាក់ពាក្យប្តឹងសុំឲ្យមានការពិនិត្យរឿងក្តីឡើងវិញជាមួយតុលាការឧទ្ធរណ៍រដ្ឋ Oregon ដោយអនុវត្តតាមសេចក្តីណែនាំដែលសរសេរនៅខាងចុងបញ្ចប់នៃសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ។

Laotian

ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ – ຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້ມີຜົນກະທົບຕໍ່ກັບເງິນຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອການຫວ່າງງານຂອງທ່ານ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້, ກະລຸນາຕິດຕໍ່ຫາຄະນະກຳມະການອຸທອນການຈ້າງງານໃນທັນທີ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຫັນດີນຳຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້, ທ່ານສາມາດຍື່ນຄຳຮ້ອງຂໍການທົບທວນຄຳຕັດສິນນຳສານອຸທອນລັດ Oregon ໄດ້ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄຳແນະນຳທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້.

Arabic

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فوراً، و إذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار .

Farsi

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از دستور العمل موجود در پایان آن، از دادگاه تجدید نظر اورگان درخواست تجدید نظر کنید.

Employment Appeals Board - 875 Union Street NE | Salem, OR 97311
 Phone: (503) 378-2077 | 1-800-734-6949 | Fax: (503) 378-2129 | TDD: 711
www.Oregon.gov/Employ/eab

The Oregon Employment Department is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. Language assistance is available to persons with limited English proficiency at no cost.

El Departamento de Empleo de Oregon es un programa que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades. Disponemos de servicios o ayudas auxiliares, formatos alternos y asistencia de idiomas para personas con discapacidades o conocimiento limitado del inglés, a pedido y sin costo.