

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2023-EAB-0507

Modified ~ Overpayment, No Penalties

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On January 27, 2023, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant willfully made misrepresentations and failed to report material facts to obtain benefits, and assessing an overpayment of \$4,393 in regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) and \$2,400 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) that claimant was required to repay, a \$2,037.90 monetary penalty, and a 42-week disqualification from future benefits. Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On April 13, 2023, ALJ Janzen conducted a hearing, and on April 14, 2023 issued Order No. 23-UI-222113, modifying the January 27, 2023 administrative decision by concluding that claimant did not willfully make misrepresentations to obtain benefits and was not liable for a monetary penalty or penalty weeks but was liable for an overpayment of \$4,393 in regular UI benefits and \$2,400 in FPUC benefits deduction from future benefits. On May 2, 2023, the Department filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: EAB considered the Department's written argument in reaching this decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) During all times relevant to this decision, claimant worked for the employer, the Oregon Employment Department, as a business and employment specialist. Claimant's main job duty involved assisting unemployment insurance claimants with their work search responsibilities.

(2) On March 25, 2020, the employer placed claimant on a leave of absence under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) because claimant was high-risk for serious illness relating to COVID-19. For a few weeks thereafter, although he was on FMLA leave, which is typically unpaid, claimant used types of paid time off he had accrued, like vacation and sick leave time, to receive his normal pay.

(3) On April 15, 2020, claimant exhausted his accrued paid time off and went on leave without pay status. On April 17, 2020, claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits. The Department determined claimant had a valid claim with a weekly benefit amount of \$648. Claimant claimed benefits for the weeks from April 12 through June 6, 2020 (weeks 16-20 through 23-20), August 2 through 8, 2020 (week 32-20), and August 30 through September 5, 2020 (week 36-20). These are the weeks at issue.

(4) Upon going on FMLA leave, including particularly after being placed on leave without pay status on April 15, 2020, claimant stayed home and did not work. Nevertheless, claimant's supervisors keyed a form of paid time off into claimant's timesheet for each of the weeks at issue. Doing so resulted in claimant receiving credit for hours worked and wages earned for each of the weeks at issue even though he was on leave without pay status. Claimant did not know his supervisors were keying paid time off into his timesheets.

(5) When claimant claimed benefits for weeks 16-20 and 17-20, the weekly claim forms asked him to report his total gross earnings for each week. Claimant reported zero earnings each week. However, because his supervisors keyed a form of paid time off into claimant's timesheet for each week, claimant earned \$1,149.09 for week 16-20 and \$501.29 for week 17-20. The Department paid claimant \$648 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for each of weeks 16-20 and 17-20. The Department would not have paid claimant any benefits for week 16-20 had claimant accurately reported his earnings. Had claimant accurately reported his earnings, the Department would have paid him only \$362 in regular UI benefits and \$600 in FPUC benefits for week 17-20.

(6) On May 1, 2020, at the time that he would typically receive his paycheck, claimant received a payment from the Department deposited into his bank account. The payment reflected claimant's earnings for April 2020, and included earnings via his supervisors keying in a form of paid time off into claimant's timesheets without his knowledge. When claimant saw the payment, he did not think it was unusual. Claimant was expecting to receive some pay from the Department for April because, prior to going on leave without pay status, he had used his accrued time off to receive his normal pay until the paid time off was exhausted.

(7) When claimant claimed benefits for weeks 18-20, 19-20, 20-20, 21-20 and 22-20, the weekly claim forms asked him to report his total gross earnings for each week. Claimant again reported zero earnings each week. However, because his supervisors keyed a form of paid time off into claimant's timesheet for each week, claimant earned \$240.78 for week 18-20, \$230.23 for week 19-20, \$1,203.81 for week 20-20, \$1,203.81 for week 21-20, and \$1,124.06 for week 22-20. The Department paid claimant \$648 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for each of weeks 18-20, 19-20, 20-20, 21-20, and 22-20. The Department would not have paid claimant any benefits for weeks 20-20, 21-20, and 22-20 had claimant accurately reported his earnings. Had claimant accurately reported his earnings, the Department would have paid him only \$623 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for week 18-20, and \$633 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for week 19-20.

(8) On June 1, 2020, claimant received another payment from the Department deposited into his bank account at the time he would typically receive his paycheck. The payment reflected claimant's earnings for May 2020, which came as a result of claimant's supervisors keying in a form of paid time off into

claimant's timesheets without his knowledge. The June 1, 2020 payment surprised claimant. On June 8, 2020, claimant emailed the employer's human resources (H.R.) manager requesting the H.R. manager clarify the status of his pay. Claimant did not receive a response.

(9) When claimant claimed benefits for week 23-20, the weekly claim form asked him to report his total gross earnings for the week. Claimant reported zero earnings. However, because his supervisors keyed a form of paid time off into claimant's timesheet for that week, claimant earned \$394.99. The Department paid claimant \$648 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for week 23-20. Had claimant accurately reported his earnings, the Department would have paid him only \$469 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for week 23-20.

(10) On June 19, 2020, claimant again emailed the H.R. manager. Claimant stated, "I have received an unspecified payment from the employment department with no explanation. I am very confused. I am out on [leave without pay] according to the options that you have presented to me. I am again seeking an explanation and would like to address this apparent error as soon as possible." Exhibit 2 at 43. On June 23, 2020, the H.R. manager sent claimant and his supervisors an email that did not explain the June 1, 2020 payment but confirmed receipt of a doctor's note to continue claimant's FMLA leave. Exhibit 2 at 44. In the June 23, 2020 email, the H.R. manager also told claimant's supervisors to continue entering claimant's time as leave without pay in the employer's time system. Exhibit 2 at 44. On July 14, 2020, the employer's payroll department sent claimant an encrypted email that sought to explain the June 1, 2020 payment. Later that day, claimant responded "I'm afraid that this information provides very little explanation to my questions and leaves me in a dilemma." Exhibit 2 at 42.

(11) When claimant claimed benefits for weeks 32-20 and 36-20, the weekly claim form asked him to report his total gross earnings for each week. Claimant reported zero earnings for each week. However, because his supervisors keyed a form of paid time off into claimant's timesheet for each week, claimant earned \$1,101.49 for week 32-20 and \$1,131.50 for week 36-20. The Department paid claimant \$648 in regular UI and \$600 in FPUC benefits for each of weeks 32-20 and 36-20. The Department would not have paid claimant any benefits for weeks 32-20 or 36-20 had claimant accurately reported his earnings.

(12) Claimant reported zero earnings for each of the weeks at issue because he had not worked any of the weeks, was on leave without pay status, did not know his supervisors were keying paid time off into his timesheets, and therefore did not think the May 1 or June 1, 2020 payments were earnings he had to report.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 23-UI-222113 is modified. Claimant was overpaid \$4,393 in regular UI benefits and is liable under ORS 657.310(1) to repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable. Such overpayment may be collected by the Department within five years following the week in which the January 27, 2023 administrative decision becomes final. Claimant is liable for an overpayment of \$2,400 in FPUC benefits to be recovered in accordance with the same procedures as apply to recovery of claimant's regular UI overpayment. Claimant is not liable for a monetary penalty or penalty weeks.

Remuneration. In relevant part, OAR 471-030-0017(1)(b) (January 11, 2018) defines "earnings" as "remuneration." Subpart (1)(c) of the administrative rule defines "remuneration" as "compensation

resulting from the employer-employee relationship” and includes “wages, salaries, incentive pay, sick pay, compensatory pay, bonuses, commissions, stand-by pay, and tips.”

Claimant went on FMLA leave on March 25, 2020 and thereafter used his accrued paid time off to receive his normal pay until he went on leave without pay status on April 15, 2020. At that point, the record shows that claimant was eligible to have applied to his timesheets either paid leave time donated by colleagues or borrowed paid leave time based on what claimant was projected to accrue in the future. *See Exhibit 2 at 37.* More likely than not, it was one of these types of paid time off that claimant’s supervisors keyed into claimant’s timesheets without his knowledge for each of the weeks at issue. Both types of paid time off were compensatory in nature since they provided for claimant to be paid. Both types of paid time off also resulted from the employer-employee relationship, as they were forms of paid time off that the employer offered. Accordingly, the payments claimant received for each of the weeks at issue via his supervisors keying a form of paid time off into his timesheets constituted “compensation resulting from the employer-employee relationship.” As a result, the payments claimant received for each of the weeks at issue constituted “remuneration” and “earnings” as those terms are defined by OAR 471-030-0017(1)(b) and (c).

An individual is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits if they are not unemployed. ORS 657.155(1)(e) (“An *unemployed individual* shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week . . .”) (emphasis added). Per ORS 657.100(1), an individual is deemed “unemployed”:

in any week during which the individual performs no services and with respect to which no remuneration for services performed is paid or payable to the individual, or in any week of less than full-time work if the remuneration paid or payable to the individual for services performed during the week is less than the individual’s weekly benefit amount.

For each of weeks 16-20, 20-20, 21-20, 22-20, 32-20, and 36-20, claimant received remuneration that exceeded his weekly benefit amount. As a result, claimant was not “unemployed” during any of these weeks within the meaning of ORS 657.100(1) and therefore was not eligible to receive benefits for those weeks.

In contrast, for each of weeks 17-20, 18-20, 19-20, and 23-20, claimant received remuneration in amounts that were less than his weekly benefit amount. Because claimant received remuneration for these weeks in amounts that did not exceed his weekly benefit amount, claimant met the latter criteria set forth by ORS 657.100(1), *i.e.*, that “the remuneration paid or payable . . . for services performed during the week is less than the individual’s weekly benefit amount.” Therefore, claimant was not ineligible to receive benefits for weeks 17-20, 18-20, 19-20, and 23-20 on the basis of not being “unemployed.”

However, claimant’s weekly benefit amounts for weeks 17-20, 18-20, 19-20, and 23-20 were subject to a reduction based on the earnings claimant received during each week. ORS 657.150(6) provides:

An eligible unemployed individual who has employment in any week shall have the individual’s weekly benefit amount reduced by the amount of earnings paid or payable that exceeds whichever is the greater of the following amounts:

- (a) Ten times the minimum hourly wage established by the laws of this state; or
- (b) One-third of the individual's weekly benefit amount.

Applying ORS 657.150(6) to week 17-20, claimant's weekly benefit amount was \$648 and the applicable minimum wage for Oregon was \$12.50 per hour.¹ Ten times the \$12.50 per hour minimum wage is \$125. One-third of claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount is \$215.99. The greater of those two amounts is \$215.99. The amount of claimant's \$501.29 earnings for week 17-20 that exceeded \$215.99 was \$285.30. Claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount for week 17-20 is therefore reduced dollar for dollar by \$285.30, which equals \$362.70 and is rounded down to the next lower full dollar amount.² Thus, claimant's reduced weekly benefit amount for week 17-20 was \$362.

Applying ORS 657.150(6) to week 18-20, one-third of claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount is \$215.99, which is more than ten times the \$12.50 per hour minimum wage. The amount of claimant's \$240.78 earnings for week 18-20 that exceeded \$215.99 was \$24.79. Claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount for week 18-20 is therefore reduced dollar for dollar by \$24.79, which equals \$623.21 and is rounded down to the next lower full dollar amount. Thus, claimant's reduced weekly benefit amount for week 18-20 was \$623.

Applying ORS 657.150(6) to week 19-20, one-third of claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount is \$215.99, which is more than ten times the \$12.50 per hour minimum wage. The amount of claimant's \$230.23 earnings for week 19-20 that exceeded \$215.99 was \$14.24. Claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount for week 19-20 is therefore reduced dollar for dollar by \$14.24, which equals \$633.76 and is rounded down to the next lower full dollar amount. Thus, claimant's reduced weekly benefit amount for week 19-20 was \$633.

Applying ORS 657.150(6) to week 23-20, one-third of claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount is \$215.99, which is more than ten times the \$12.50 per hour minimum wage. The amount of claimant's \$394.99 earnings for week 23-20 that exceeded \$215.99 was \$179. Claimant's \$648 weekly benefit amount for week 23-20 is therefore reduced dollar for dollar by \$179, which equals \$469 and is rounded down to the next lower full dollar amount. Thus, claimant's reduced weekly benefit amount for week 23-20 was \$469.

In summary, claimant was not eligible to receive benefits for weeks 16-20, 20-20, 21-20, 22-20, 32-20, and 36-20. Claimant was eligible to receive benefits for weeks 17-20, 18-20, 19-20, and 23-20, but at reduced weekly benefit amounts of \$362, \$623, \$633, and \$469, respectively.

¹ OAR 471-030-0017(2)(i) provides that "[f]or purposes of ORS 657.150(6)(a), the term "minimum hourly wage" means the minimum wage rate as computed under 653.025(2)." ORS 653.025(2)(d) establishes a \$12.50 per hour minimum wage for the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area applicable from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020. Week 23-20 was the week of May 31, 2020 through June 6, 2020.

² ORS 657.152 states, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter to the contrary, any amount of unemployment compensation payable to any individual for any week if not an even dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower full dollar amount."

Overpayment of Regular UI benefits. ORS 657.310(1)(a) 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.* Such benefits "may be collected for any week or weeks within five years following the week in which the decision establishing the erroneous payment became final." ORS 657.310(1)(c). In addition, an individual who has been overpaid benefits under ORS 657.215 because the individual made a willful misrepresentation to obtain benefits is liable for a penalty in an amount of at least 15, but not greater than 30, percent of the amount of the overpayment. ORS 657.310(2)(a). Moreover, an individual who willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failed to report a material fact, to obtain benefits, may be disqualified for benefits for a period not to exceed 52 weeks. ORS 657.215.

ORS 657.315(1)(a) provides, in relevant part, that an individual who has been overpaid benefits because of an error not caused by the individual's false statement, misrepresentation of a material fact or failure to disclose a material fact, or because an initial decision to pay benefits is subsequently reversed by a decision finding the individual is not eligible for the benefits, is liable to have the amount deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to the individual under this chapter for any week or weeks within five years following the week in which the decision establishing the erroneous payment became final.

Claimant received regular UI benefits to which he was not entitled for each of the weeks at issue. As to weeks 16-20, 20-20, 21-20, 22-20, 32-20, and 36-20, had claimant reported his gross earnings accurately, the Department would not have paid claimant any benefits. Accordingly, for each of weeks 16-20, 20-20, 21-20, 22-20, 32-20, and 36-20 claimant received \$648 to which he was not entitled. Similarly, because claimant failed to report accurate earnings information, he received \$286 to which he was not entitled for week 17-20 ($\$648 - \$362 = \$286$). He received \$25 to which he was not entitled for week 18-20 ($\$648 - \$623 = \$25$). He received \$15 to which he was not entitled for week 19-20 ($\$648 - \$633 = \$15$). Finally, he received \$179 to which he was not entitled for week 23-20 ($\$648 - \$469 = \$179$). Adding these overpayment figures together, the record shows claimant received \$4,393 in regular UI benefits to which he was not entitled.

The order under review concluded that claimant's regular UI overpayment was governed by ORS 657.315. Order No. 23-UI-222113 at 5. Specifically, the order reasoned that claimant's overpayment was due to agency error because the Department also was claimant's employer. Order No. 23-UI-222113 at 5. The record does not support this conclusion.

Claimant was on leave without pay status during the weeks at issue and was unaware that his supervisors were keying paid time off into his timesheets. That the Department, in its role as claimant's employer, failed to convey to claimant that this was occurring is regrettable. However, it does not constitute an agency error for purposes of 657.315(1)(a), as that section contemplates errors made by the Department in its role as the agency administering the unemployment insurance program, not in its role as the employer of a claimant. Here, because his supervisors keyed paid time off into his timesheets, claimant received earnings for each of the weeks at issue. Moreover, for each of the weeks at issue, the weekly claim form asked claimant to report his total gross earnings. By reporting zero earnings for each of the weeks at issue, claimant made false statements that resulted in him receiving benefits to which he

was not entitled. The record supports that claimant genuinely believed he had no earnings for the weeks at issue because he was on leave without pay status and did not know his supervisors were keying paid time off into his timesheets. However, ORS 657.310 applies regardless of whether claimant knew or intended to provide false information. As such, claimant's regular UI overpayment is governed by ORS 657.310.

However, claimant is not liable for a monetary penalty or penalty weeks under ORS 657.310(2)(a) and ORS 657.215. The record fails to show that claimant's false statements were made willfully to obtain benefits. Claimant reported zero earnings for each of the weeks at issue because he had not worked any of the weeks, was on leave without pay status, and did not know his supervisors were keying paid time off into his timesheets. Claimant therefore did not think the payments the Department deposited in his bank account on May 1 or June 1, 2020 constituted earnings. The record shows claimant tried to clarify the nature of the June 1, 2020 payment with the employer's HR manager via email on June 8, 2020 but received no response. Exhibit 2 at 41. Claimant emailed the HR manager again on June 19, 2020 and expressed his confusion and desire for clarification regarding the June 1, 2020 payment. Exhibit 2 at 43. The HR manager responded on June 23, 2020, but did not offer an explanation regarding the June 1, 2020 payment and instead reinforced the impression that claimant was not receiving paid time off by telling claimant's supervisors to continue entering claimant's time as leave without pay in the employer's time system. Exhibit 2 at 44. Though claimant did receive an explanatory email from the employer's payroll department on July 14, 2020, the substance of that email is unknown due to it being encrypted. Further, claimant's response to the email in which he stated "I'm afraid that this information provides very little explanation to my questions[.]" indicates that claimant remained confused. The foregoing evidence is sufficient to demonstrate that claimant's false statements on his weekly claim forms were not made willfully to obtain benefits.

Accordingly, claimant was overpaid \$4,393 in regular UI benefits to which he was not entitled and is liable under ORS 657.310(1) to repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to claimant during the five-year period following the date the January 27, 2023 administrative decision becomes final. Claimant is not liable for a monetary penalty or penalty weeks under ORS 657.310(2)(a) and ORS 657.215.

Overpayment of FPUC benefits. Under the provisions of the CARES Act, 15 U.S.C. § 9023, claimant also received FPUC benefits to which he was not entitled. FPUC is a federal benefits program that provided eligible individuals with \$600 per week, in addition to their regular UI weekly benefit amount, during the period of March 29, 2020 through July 25, 2020 (weeks 14-20 through 30-20). *See* U.S. Dep't of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 15-20 (April 4, 2020) at 6, (UIPL 15-20). Individuals were eligible to receive the full \$600 FPUC benefit if they were eligible to receive at least one dollar of regular UI benefits for the claimed week. UIPL 15-20 at I-5.

Because claimant was not eligible for at least one dollar of regular UI benefits for each of weeks 16-20, 20-20, 21-20, and 22-20, he also was ineligible to receive FPUC benefits for those weeks. *See* U.S. Dep't of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 15-20 (April 4, 2020) at I-7 ("If an individual is deemed ineligible for regular compensation in a week and the denial creates an overpayment for the entire weekly benefit amount, the FPUC payment for the week will also be denied. And the FPUC overpayment must also be created."). Claimant is not liable for an overpayment of FPUC benefits for weeks 32-20 or 36-20 because the FPUC program was not operative during those weeks.

Accordingly, claimant's FPUC overpayment is \$2,400 (\$600 x 4 weeks = \$2,400). Under 15 U.S.C. § 9023(f)(3)(A), the Department may recover the FPUC benefits by deduction from any future FPUC payments payable to claimant or from any future unemployment compensation payable to claimant under any state or federal unemployment compensation law administered by the Department during the three-year period following the date he received the FPUC benefits to which he was not entitled.

United States Department of Labor guidance documents elaborate that while an FPUC overpayment may be offset by other State and Federal unemployment benefits payable during this three-year period, State agencies "must recover the amount of FPUC to which an individual was not entitled in accordance with the same procedures as apply to recovery of overpayments of regular [UI] paid by the State." UIPL 15-20 at I-7. "After three years, a State may continue to recover FPUC overpayments through means other than benefit offsets, according to State law." UIPL 15-20 at I-7. Therefore, because the provision of state law governing claimant's regular UI overpayment is ORS 657.310(1), claimant is liable to repay the amount of his FPUC overpayment or have it deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to claimant under ORS Chapter 657 during the five-year period following the date the January 27, 2023 administrative decision becomes final.

In sum, the order under review is modified. Claimant is liable for an overpayment of \$4,393 in regular UI benefits per ORS 657.310(1) and is liable to repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from future benefits payable during the five-year period following the date the January 27, 2023 administrative decision becomes final. Claimant is liable for an overpayment of \$2,400 in FPUC benefits to be recovered in accordance with the same procedures as apply to recovery of claimant's regular UI overpayment. Claimant is not liable for a monetary penalty or penalty weeks.

DECISION: Order No. 23-UI-222113 is modified, as outlined above.

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

DATE of Service: June 9, 2023

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.

NOTE: The Department may defer recovery or completely waive the overpaid amount if certain standards are met. To make a request for Waiver of Overpayment Recovery, call 503-947-1995 or email OED_Overpayment_unit@employ.oregon.gov. You must submit waiver applications that correspond to the program for which you were overpaid benefits. **If you were overpaid benefits under both state and federal benefits programs, you will need to file two separate waiver applications.** To access a State UI Overpayment Waiver application go online to <https://unemployment.oregon.gov/waivers> and click the link for "State UI Overpayment Waiver". To access a Federal Program Overpayment Waiver application go online to

<https://unemployment.oregon.gov/waivers> and click the link for “Federal Program Overpayment Waiver”.

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 ໄດ້ ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄໍາແນະນຳທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້.

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.