

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2023-EAB-0417

Reversed & Remanded

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On November 9, 2021, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant failed to disclose a material fact and was overpaid \$1,963 in regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) and \$3,900 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) benefits that claimant must repay (decision # 94055). On November 29, 2021, decision # 94055 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On February 22, 2022, the Department served notice of an administrative decision denying claimant's request for a waiver of the \$3,900 FPUC overpayment that the Department had assessed in decision # 94055 (decision # 150115). On March 11, 2022, claimant filed a late request for hearing on decision # 94055 and a timely request for hearing on decision # 150115. On February 28, 2023, ALJ Blam conducted a hearing, and on March 15, 2023 issued Order No. 23-UI-219033 dismissing claimant's request for hearing on decision # 94055 as late without good cause, and Order No. 23-UI-219031 affirming decision # 150115. On March 20, 2023, claimant filed applications for review of Orders No. 23-UI-219033 and 23-UI-219031 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant's argument contained information that was not part of the hearing record, and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond claimant's reasonable control prevented her from offering the information during the hearing. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019), EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing when reaching this decision. EAB considered claimant's argument to the extent it was based on the record.

Pursuant to OAR 471-041-0095 (October 29, 2006), EAB consolidated its review of Orders No. 23-UI-219033 and 23-UI-219031. For case-tracking purposes, this decision is being issued in duplicate (EAB Decisions 2023-EAB-0417 and 2023-EAB-0416).

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On May 30, 2020, claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits. At the time of filing the initial claim, claimant was unfamiliar with the process, having last filed an unemployment insurance claim seven years in the past. When claimant filed her initial claim, she provided her mailing address. The first line of the mailing address she provided was the street address of claimant's residence in Medford, Oregon. The second line of the mailing address claimant provided was claimant's Medford post office box address.

(2) On November 9, 2021, the Department mailed decision # 94055 to claimant's address on file with the Department. The address on file included both the Medford street address and the Medford post office box address that claimant provided when she filed her initial claim.

(3) Decision # 94055 assessed an overpayment of \$1,963 in regular UI benefits and \$3,900 in FPUC benefits that claimant was liable to repay the Department. Decision # 94055 concluded that claimant had received earnings for the weeks from February 21 through May 22, 2021 (weeks 08-21 through 20-21) that made her ineligible for benefits for those weeks because the earnings exceeded her weekly benefit amount. The decision concluded that because claimant had not reported the earnings at the time she claimed weeks 08-21 through 20-21, she was paid benefits for those weeks to which she was not entitled. Decision # 94055 also stated that claimant had the right to appeal the decision, and that any appeal had to be filed on or before November 29, 2021 to be timely.

(4) Claimant did not receive decision # 94055. Decision # 94055 was not delivered either to claimant's Medford post office box address or her Medford street address. Claimant generally did not receive mail via her Medford street address because the prior occupant of the residence had halted mail delivery to the address, which caused problems with delivery that claimant "hassled with . . . for eight and a half years," and that the U.S. Postal Service "never could get . . . right." Transcript at 9. The street address had a mailbox and claimant checked it on occasion to see if "the postman put something in there," but "nothing ever got delivered." Transcript at 10. As a result, claimant received mail through the Medford post office box exclusively, and did not receive mail at the street address at all.

(5) In December 2021, claimant moved from the residence associated with the Medford street address that was included in her address on file with the Department. Claimant did not update her address with the Department because the address she provided the Department at the time of initial claim filing contained her Medford post office box address. The Medford post office box address, the only address through which claimant received mail, remained unchanged.

(6) At some point on or prior to January 11, 2022, claimant gained some knowledge of the overpayment that the Department had assessed against her. On January 11, 2022, claimant called the Department regarding the overpayment. During the call, a Department representative helped claimant complete a request for waiver of her \$3,900 FPUC overpayment. On January 14, 2022, claimant formally submitted the waiver request to the Department.

(7) On February 24, 2022, claimant again called the Department. The Department representative documented the call as follows:

2/24/22 [per telephone call] clmt calling to have reason for OP mailed to her. Submitted schedule [*sic*] of adjustments to the OSI mail project > OP decisions to be resent.¹

¹ EAB has taken notice of this fact, which is contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). Any party that objects to our taking notice of this information must submit such objection to this office in writing, setting forth the basis of the objection in writing, within ten days of our mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless such objection is received and sustained, the noticed fact will remain in the record.

(8) On March 7, 2022, claimant again called the Department. The Department representative documented the call as follows:

3/7/22 [per telephone call] clmt neede [sic] info on how to file appeal and process, number for appeals dept was also provided.²

(9) On March 11, 2022 claimant filed requests for hearing on decisions # 94055 and 150115.

(10) Claimant received \$1,664 per month in Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) benefits. Claimant also worked as an on-call substitute teacher. Claimant earned about \$600 per month from that work, on average, though the substitute teaching work was variable, and she sometimes earned \$160 per month or less. Claimant's monthly expenses, including rent, renter's insurance, utilities, car payment, car insurance, car maintenance and fuel, telephone, internet, credit card bills, medical bills, toiletries, and cleaning products amounted to \$1,634.99.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 23-UI-219033 is set aside and the matter remanded for further development of the record as to whether claimant's late request for hearing on decision # 94055 should be allowed, and if so, the merits of that decision. Order No. 23-UI-219031 also is reversed and the matter remanded for further development of the record.

Order No. 23-UI-219033—Late Request for Hearing. ORS 657.269 provides that the Department's decisions become final unless a party files a request for hearing within 20 days after the date the decision is mailed. ORS 657.875 provides that the 20-day deadline may be extended a "reasonable time" upon a showing of "good cause." OAR 471-040-0010 (February 10, 2012) provides that "good cause" includes factors beyond an applicant's reasonable control or an excusable mistake, and defines "reasonable time" as seven days after those factors ceased to exist.

The request for hearing on decision # 94055 was due by November 29, 2021. Because claimant did not file her request for hearing until March 11, 2022, the request was late.

Order No. 23-UI-219033 concluded that claimant did not establish good cause to extend the filing deadline because claimant did not rebut the presumption that decision # 94055 was received in the regular course of the mail because claimant did not check the mailbox at her Medford street address. Order No. 23-UI-219033 at 4. Order No. 23-UI-219033 further concluded that claimant did not establish good cause because claimant was responsible for providing a correct mailing address to the Department. Order No. 23-UI-219033 at 4. The record does not support these conclusions.

It is correct that documents "sent through the U.S. Postal Service by regular mail are presumed to have been received by the addressee, subject to evidence to the contrary." OAR 137-003-0520(10) (effective January 31, 2012); *See also* ORS 40.135(q) (setting forth a similar presumption in civil and criminal court proceedings). However, claimant rebutted the presumption because she provided ample evidence that she did not receive decision # 94055.

² EAB has taken notice of this fact, which is contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1). Any party that objects to our taking notice of this information must submit such objection to this office in writing, setting forth the basis of the objection in writing, within ten days of our mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless such objection is received and sustained, the noticed fact will remain in the record.

At hearing, claimant repeatedly testified that she did not receive decision # 94055. Transcript at 7-9. Claimant testified that she never received the decision via her Medford post office box. Transcript at 7. Claimant also explained that she did not receive mail via her Medford street address generally because the prior occupant of the residence had halted mail delivery to the address, which caused problems with delivery that claimant “hassled with . . . for eight and a half years,” and that the U.S. Postal Service “never could get . . . right.” Transcript at 9. Contrary to the order’s assertion that claimant did not check the mailbox at her Medford street address, claimant testified that she checked the mailbox on occasion to see if “the postman put something in there,” but “nothing ever got delivered.” Transcript at 10. Claimant further testified in reference to the Medford street address mailbox, “I just didn’t get mail there, at all.” Transcript at 9. The foregoing evidence is sufficient to rebut the presumption that claimant received decision # 94055 in the mail.

Order No. 23-UI-219033 also concluded that claimant did not establish good cause for filing the late request for hearing because claimant was responsible for providing the Department a correct mailing address. Order No. 23-UI-219033 at 4. It is possible that claimant’s listing of both her Medford street address and Medford post office box address on her initial claim form produced a dual address on file with the Department that contributed to claimant’s failure to receive decision # 94055. However, to the extent this was true, and was caused by an error on the part of the postal service or the Department, claimant’s non-receipt of decision # 94055 at either address constituted a factor beyond her reasonable control.

In the alternative, to the extent that claimant’s listing of both her Medford street address and Medford post office box address on her initial claim form caused the delivery error, her having done so was an excusable mistake. At the time of filing the initial claim, claimant was unfamiliar with the process, having last filed an unemployment insurance claim seven years prior. The record supports the inference that claimant gave the dual addresses on her initial claim form in an effort to provide complete information. Given claimant’s lack of familiarity with unemployment and good intentions in listing the two addresses, to the extent doing so contributed to claimant not receiving decision # 94055, listing the dual addresses reflected an inability to follow directions despite substantial efforts to comply, and therefore was an excusable mistake.

Thus, the record shows that claimant did not receive decision # 94055, which either amounted to a factor beyond her reasonable control that prevented a filing by the November 29, 2021 deadline, or was caused by an excusable mistake. Claimant’s late appeal must be allowed if the date claimant filed her late request for hearing, March 11, 2022, occurred within a seven-day “reasonable time” of when the factors that prevented a timely filing ceased to exist.

Order No. 23-UI-219033 found that on January 11, 2022, claimant was advised in a call with a Department representative that she had received decision # 94055. Order No. 23-UI-219033 at 2, ¶ 5. On that basis, Order No. 23-UI-219033 concluded that even if claimant did establish good cause to extend the filing deadline, she failed to file within a reasonable time because the factors that prevented a timely filing ceased by January 11, 2022, and claimant did not appeal until March 11, 2022. Order No. 23-UI-219033 at 4. The record as developed does not support this conclusion or the finding upon which it was based.

At hearing, when asked to provide any final information on the late appeal issue, the witness for the Department read into the record a claim comment from January 11, 2022 that stated, “Per telephone call, Claimant received o – overpayment decision, wanted clarification and next steps. Assisted her with submitting a waiver.” Transcript at 13. The ALJ then asked claimant whether she spoke to the Department on January 11, 2022, and claimant testified that the Department took her waiver request over the phone that day. Transcript at 15. This evidence is the source of Order No. 23-UI-219033’s finding that claimant had received decision # 94055 by January 11, 2022.

However, the ALJ did not ask claimant if claimant ever received decision # 94055 and, if so, when, or if she did not receive it, when she otherwise became aware of the decision and her right to appeal it. The record supports an inference that by January 11, 2022, claimant had gained at least some knowledge of the existence of an overpayment because she called the Department on that date about the overpayment. The record further suggests that claimant ultimately did receive decision # 94055, not in January 2022 or before, but in March 2022 because claimant testified, “As soon as I got the letter in March, I immediately responded.” Transcript at 7. The likelihood that claimant did not receive decision # 94055 until March 2022 is bolstered by relevant claim comments that went unmentioned by the Department witness at hearing. Specifically, Department records show that in succession, directly after the claim comment read into the record by the witness, the following two comments appear:

2/24/22 [per telephone call] clmt calling to have reason for OP mailed to her. Submitted schedule [sic] of adjustments to the OSI mail project > OP decisions to be resent.

3/7/22 [per telephone call] clmt neede [sic] info on how to file appeal and process, number for appeals dept was also provided.

These comments call into question that claimant ever stated that she had received decision # 94055 during the January 11, 2022 call with the Department. Rather, they indicate that on February 24, 2022, claimant called the Department wishing to know the reason she was assessed an overpayment and requesting that decision # 94055 be sent to her, which is consistent with not having received the decision up to that point. Further, they indicate that on March 7, 2022, claimant called again asking how to file an appeal, which is consistent with receipt of decision # 94055 sometime after February 24, 2022, possibly on or after March 4, 2022. March 4, 2022 was within seven days of claimant’s March 11, 2022 late request for hearing.

Remand therefore is necessary to develop the record on the issue of whether and when the factor beyond claimant’s control ceased to exist, and whether claimant filed her appeal within a reasonable time of that date. The ALJ should inquire when, if ever, claimant actually received decision # 94055. The ALJ should ask claimant whether she had received decision # 94055 as of January 11, 2022, and if not, whether she received an overpayment bill or some other correspondence that referenced the overpayment and prompted her to call about it on January 11, 2022. The ALJ should ask whether the Department representative informed her of her right to appeal decision # 94055 during the January 11, 2022 call, or if the conversation focused only on submitting a request for waiver of the overpayment. The ALJ should clarify what prompted claimant’s February 24, 2022 and March 7, 2022 calls to the Department. The ALJ should develop the record to determine whether and when the Department sent a copy of decision # 94055 to claimant in response to those calls, and whether claimant filed her appeal within a seven-day “reasonable time” of learning of decision # 94055 and her right to appeal it.

If, on remand, the record shows that claimant filed her late request for hearing on decision # 94055 within a reasonable time of the factor that prevented a timely filing ceasing to exist, the ALJ should conduct a full and fair hearing on the merits of decision # 94055.

Order No. 23-UI-219031—FPUC Overpayment Waiver. Waiver of FPUC overpayments are governed by the provisions of Section 2104(f)(2)(A)-(B) of the CARES Act, 15 U.S.C. § 9023(f), which requires, for waiver to be granted, that the overpayment of FPUC benefits be: (1) without fault on the part of the claimant, and (2) that repayment be contrary to equity and good conscience. Federal guidance provides that, in general, “an individual is considered to be without fault when the individual provided all information correctly as requested by the state, but the state failed to take appropriate action with that information or took delayed action when determining eligibility.” Unemployment Insurance Program Letter 20-21, Change 1 (UIPL 20-21 Change 1) at 9 (February 7, 2022). However, a state may also find that an individual is without fault for the following reasons:

[I]f the individual provided incorrect information due to conflicting, changing, or confusing information or instructions from the state; the individual was unable to reach the state despite their best efforts to inquire or clarify what information the individual needed to provide; or other similar difficulties (*e.g.*, education, literacy, and/or language barriers) in understanding what information the state needed from the individual[.]” UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 10.

With respect to the “contrary to equity and good conscience” element, federal guidance provides that states may defer to state law in defining what it means for repayment to be contrary to equity and good conscience, or may use the federal standard. UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 10. The federal standard provides that recovery is “contrary to equity and good conscience” when one of at least three circumstances are present: (1) recovery would cause financial hardship to the person from whom it is sought; (2) the recipient of the overpayment can show (regardless of their financial situation) that due to the notice that such payment would be made or because of the incorrect payment, either they have relinquished a valuable right or changed positions for the worse; or (3) recovery would be unconscionable under the circumstances. UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 10-13. The guidance elaborates that recovery would cause financial hardship where “review of the individual’s income to debts (including copies of pay records and bills) reflects the hardship caused by having to repay an overpayment because the individual needs much of their current income and liquid assets (including the CARES Act benefits received) to meet ordinary and necessary living expenses and liabilities.” UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 11.

Order No. 23-UI-219031 concluded that claimant was not eligible for a waiver of her FPUC overpayment because she failed to report her earnings when claiming her weekly benefits for weeks 08-21 through 20-21 and therefore was at least partially at fault for the overpayment. Order No. 23-UI-219031 at 3-4. The record as developed does not support this conclusion.

As an initial matter, Order No. 23-UI-219033, pertaining to claimant’s regular UI and FPUC overpayments, is being remanded as discussed above. If the remand hearing on Order No. 23-UI-219033 reaches the merits of decision # 94055, it is possible that the amount of claimant’s FPUC overpayment may change. Any such change to the amount of claimant’s FPUC overpayment could have a

corresponding effect on claimant's eligibility for a waiver of the FPUC overpayment. Therefore, reversing Order No. 23-UI-219031 along with Order No. 23-UI-219033 is warranted.

Reversing Order No. 23-UI-219031 also is warranted for an additional reason. In its analysis, Order No. 23-UI-219031 failed to apply the waiver law applicable to FPUC overpayments, instead citing law that applies to waiving overpayments under a different benefits program, Lost Wages Assistance (LWA). Although Order No. 23-UI-219031 determined that claimant's FPUC overpayment waiver request failed because claimant did not meet the "without fault" element, review of the record shows that the ALJ made virtually no inquiry as to why claimant failed to report her earnings when claiming weeks 08-21 through 20-21. Therefore, it is unknown whether claimant failed to provide the earnings information due to conflicting, changing, or confusing information or instructions, inability to reach the Department despite best efforts, or other barriers. Under UIPL 20-21 Change 1, if claimant failed to provide the earnings information because of reasons like these, it may be concluded that she was without fault in causing the FPUC overpayment.

On remand, the ALJ should ask why claimant failed to report her earnings when claiming weeks 08-21 through 20-21. The inquiry should be tailored to develop the record as to whether claimant failed to provide the earnings information due to conflicting, changing, or confusing information or instructions, inability to reach the Department despite best efforts, or other barriers. To this end, the ALJ should determine whether instructions for reporting claimant's earnings information were conflicting, changing, or confusing. Further, because the record shows claimant received Social Security Disability Insurance benefits, the ALJ should inquire as to the nature and extent of claimant's disability and whether the disability constituted a barrier affecting claimant's ability to provide her earnings information. Inquiry should also be made as to whether claimant experienced difficulty contacting the Department for clarification about reporting earnings for weeks 08-21 through 20-21, such as if phone lines were busy or dropped claimant's calls.

Note that the record as developed is sufficient to conclude that claimant met the element that repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. Although the Department had the option to use either the state standard or the federal standard in defining what it means for repayment to be contrary to equity and good conscience, the record is silent as to which approach the Department selected. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is reasonable to conclude that the Department opted to apply the federal standard, given that the FPUC program is a federal benefits program.

Applying the federal approach, the record shows that repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience because recovery would cause financial hardship to claimant. Claimant's income amounted to \$2,264.00 per month on average (although claimant's substitute teaching work was variable and some months her income was lower), but claimant had monthly expenses totaling about \$1,634.99 per month. In light of claimant's income-to-expenses ratio, which shows that her monthly expenses made up a substantial amount of her monthly income, the record shows that claimant needs much of her current income to meet ordinary and necessary living expenses and liabilities. As a result, requiring her to repay the \$3,900.00 FPUC overpayment would cause her a financial hardship.

To summarize, as to Order No. 23-UI-219033, remand is necessary to develop the record on the issue of whether and when the factors beyond claimant's control ceased to exist and whether claimant filed her appeal within a reasonable time of that date. If, on remand, the record shows that claimant filed her late

request for hearing on decision # 94055 within a reasonable time after the factors that prevented a timely filing ceased to exist, the ALJ should conduct a full and fair hearing on the merits of decision # 94055. As to Order No. 23-UI-219031, remand is necessary because any change to the amount of claimant's FPUC overpayment following remand of Order No. 23-UI-219033 may have a corresponding effect on claimant's request for a waiver of the FPUC overpayment. Remand of Order No. 23-UI-219031 is also necessary to develop the record regarding whether claimant failed to provide earnings information for weeks 08-21 through 20-21 due to conflicting, changing, or confusing information or instructions, inability to reach the Department despite best efforts, or other barriers.

DECISION: Orders No. 23-UI-219033 and 23-UI-219031 are set aside, and these matters remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

D. Hettle and A. Steger-Bentz;
S. Serres, not participating.

DATE of Service: May 5, 2023

NOTE: The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Orders No. 23-UI-219033 or 23-UI-219031 or return these matters to EAB. Only a timely application for review of either subsequent order will cause the respective matter to return to EAB.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. You can access the survey using a computer, tablet, or smartphone. If you are unable to complete the survey online and need 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 desisyon.

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.