

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2023-EAB-0618

Reversed & Remanded

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On April 22, 2022, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant willfully made a misrepresentation and failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits, and assessing an overpayment of \$157.00 in regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) benefits, \$3,600.00 in Pandemic Unemployment Emergency Compensation (PEUC) benefits, and \$6,000.00 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) that claimant was required to repay to the Department, a \$1,463.55 monetary penalty, and a 52-week penalty disqualification from future benefits (decision # 192060). On May 5, 2022, the Department served notice of an administrative decision amending decision # 192060, though it contained the same conclusions regarding the assessment of overpayment and penalties (decision # 194245).¹ On May 5, 2022, claimant filed a timely request for hearing on decision # 192060, which is also treated as a timely request for hearing on decision # 194245.

On February 22, 2023, ALJ Janzen conducted a hearing at which the employers failed to appear, and on May 16, 2023 issued Order No. 23-UI-224944, reversing decision # 192060 by concluding that claimant did not willfully make a misrepresentation and fail to report a material fact to obtain benefits, and did not assess an overpayment or penalties. On June 7, 2023, the Department filed a timely application for review of Order No. 23-UI-224944 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

¹ The substance of the amendment was to allege that in addition to the reasons cited in decision # 192060 for assessing the overpayment, which related to work separations, that claimant was overpaid for weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21 for the additional reason that she earned remuneration during those weeks that she failed to report to the Department. EAB Exhibit 1 at 3-6.

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

EVIDENTIARY MATTER: EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). The additional evidence is the attachment to the Department's written argument, consisting of 52 pages, that was not a part of the record at hearing. The Department demonstrated that this information was properly submitted to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) prior to the hearing, but for unknown reasons was not included in the hearing record or considered by the ALJ. This evidence has been marked as EAB Exhibit 1, and a copy provided to the parties with this decision. Any party that objects to our admitting EAB Exhibit 1 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 exhibit will remain in the record.

EAB reviewed the entire hearing record. On *de novo* review and pursuant to ORS 657.275(2), the portion of the order under review concluding that claimant was not overpaid benefits based on disqualifications resulting from work separations is **adopted**. This rest of this decision addresses: the jurisdictional issues arising from the amendment of the administrative decision prior to the hearing; whether claimant was overpaid benefits for the weeks of February 28, 2021 through March 13, 2021 (weeks 09-21 through 10-21) and July 4, 2021 through July 17, 2021 (weeks 27-21 through 28-21) based on having earned remuneration during those weeks; and whether claimant willfully made a misrepresentation and failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits, either in failing to report remuneration on her weekly claims, or in failing to report work separations affecting determinations of her eligibility for benefits, and, if so, whether a monetary penalty or penalty disqualification should be imposed as a result.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On March 19, 2020, claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits.

(2) During the weeks of February 28, 2021 through March 13, 2021 (weeks 09-21 through 10-21), claimant worked for Think Maids NW. Think Maids NW subsequently reported to the Department that claimant earned \$280.00 during week 09-21 and \$340.00 during week 10-21. EAB Exhibit 1 at 29.

(3) On March 8, 2021, and March 15, 2021, claimant filed claims for benefits for weeks 09-21 and 10-21, respectively. Claimant reported on both claims that she had not worked or earned wages during those weeks. Claimant was paid \$180.00 in PEUC benefits and \$300 in FPUC benefits for each week, totaling \$360.00 and \$600.00, respectively.

(4) On March 21, 2021, Think Maids NW discharged claimant because they were dissatisfied with her work. OAH subsequently determined in Order No. 23-UI-217187 that claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct, and was not disqualified from receiving benefits based on this work separation.²

² EAB has taken notice of these facts which are 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.

(5) On March 29, 2021, claimant filed a claim for benefits for the week of March 21, 2021 through March 27, 2021 (week 12-21). Claimant did not report on this weekly claim that she had been discharged from employment during the week. However, claimant reported earning \$380.00 during that week. EAB Exhibit 1 at 43.

(6) Claimant filed weekly claims for benefits for the weeks including April 4, 2021 through July 3, 2021 (weeks 14-21 through 26-21).

(7) During the weeks of July 4, 2021 through July 17, 2021 (weeks 27-21 through 28-21), claimant worked for Harris Design & Print, Inc. On July 12, 2021 and July 26, 2021, claimant filed weekly claims for benefits for weeks 27-21 and 28-21, respectively. Claimant reported on both claims that she had not worked or earned wages during those weeks. Claimant was paid \$180.00 in PEUC benefits and \$300 in FPUC benefits for each week, totaling \$360.00 and \$600.00, respectively. Harris Design & Print, Inc. subsequently reported to the Department that claimant earned \$589.50 during week 27-21 and \$481.25 during week 28-21. EAB Exhibit 1 at 17.

(8) On August 14, 2021, Harris Design & Print, Inc. discharged claimant because the employer believed she had left work early without permission. OAH subsequently determined in Order No. 23-UI-217186 that claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct, and was not disqualified from receiving benefits based on the work separation.³ Claimant did not claim benefits for the week of August 8, 2021 through August 14, 2021 (week 32-21).

(9) On August 23, 2021, claimant filed an additional claim for benefits. Claimant reported on this claim that she had been laid off from Harris Design & Print, Inc. on August 17, 2021 due to lack of work.⁴

(10) On April 22, 2022, the Department served notice of decision # 192060. On May 5, 2022, the Department served notice of decision # 194245, which replaced decision # 192060. Also on May 5, 2022, claimant filed a request for hearing on decision # 192060.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 23-UI-224944 is set aside and the matter remanded for further proceedings.

Amended Administrative Decision. On May 5, 2022, the Department served notice of decision # 194245, which amended decision # 192060, thereby replacing it and rendering it moot. ORS 657.270(7(a)(D)) provides, “The administrative law judge may dismiss a request for hearing . . . if: . . . The issues are resolved by cancellation or amendment of the decision that is the subject of the hearing request[.]” The issues presented in decision # 192060 were a finding of misrepresentation and

³ EAB has taken notice of these facts which are 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.

⁴ EAB has taken notice of these facts which are 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.

assessment of overpayment and penalties with which claimant disagreed, and these issues were not resolved by amendment of the administrative decision. Dismissal of claimant's request for hearing on decision # 192060 was therefore not required by its amendment. As decision # 194245 was issued the same day that claimant filed her request for hearing on decision # 192060, and both decisions concerned the same issues, claimant's request for hearing is properly applied to decision # 194245. On remand, OAH should consider only decision # 194245 as the subject of claimant's appeal, as the remainder of this decision does.⁵

Overpayment Based on Remuneration. 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.* In addition, an individual who has been disqualified for benefits under ORS 657.215 for making a willful misrepresentation 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).

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.

During weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21, ORS 657.150(6) provided in pertinent part:

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) \$300; or
- (b) One-third of the individual's weekly benefit amount.

In effect, this allowed claimants to earn \$300 in gross earnings during a week before having their weekly benefit amount reduced dollar-for-dollar by any amount earned over \$300. This temporary change in the statute was effective September 6, 2020 through January 1, 2022 (weeks 37-20 through 52-21).

However, Oregon House Bill 3178, signed into law by the Governor on May 17, 2021, temporarily modified the definition of “unemployed” to remove the portion shown in strikethrough, below.

⁵At hearing, the Department conceded the overpayment at issue involves only weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21, rather than all of the weeks listed in decision # 194245.

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.~~

The effect of this temporary amendment, effective for weeks beginning May 23, 2021 through January 1, 2022 (weeks 21-21 through 52-21), is to consider individuals working less than full time to have been “unemployed,” and therefore potentially eligible for benefits. This is the case even if they earned more than their weekly benefit amount during weeks claimed during the period in which the amendment is effective.

The order under review concluded that claimant was not overpaid benefits for weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21 because “the record failed to establish that claimant had earnings during the weeks in issue.” Order No. 23-UI-224944 at 6. Further development of the record is needed to determine whether claimant had earnings during those weeks.

Claimant’s remuneration must be determined to assess her eligibility for benefits and benefit amount. If the record on remand establishes that claimant earned the remuneration alleged, it may show that she was ineligible for benefits for weeks 09-21 and 10-21 because she was not unemployed, if the wages exceeded claimant’s weekly benefit amount of \$180.00 each week. For weeks 27-21 and 28-21, when the definition of “unemployed” was modified to remove the requirement that earnings not exceed the weekly benefit amount, the earnings may reduce claimant’s benefit amount to zero.⁶

In statements to the Department, claimant’s employers represented that claimant earned \$280.00 during week 09-21, \$340.00 during week 10-21,⁷ \$589.50 during week 27-21, and \$481.25 during week 28-21. EAB Exhibit 1 at 17, 29. Claimant testified she did not work for pay during week 09-10, but did work during week 10-21, and reported \$380.00 in earnings from that week on her claim for week 12-21. Transcript at 32-33. However, in a March 31, 2022 letter to the Department, claimant stated that she worked for pay during both weeks. EAB Exhibit 1 at 36-37. Claimant testified she could not remember whether she worked during weeks 27-21 and 28-21, but denied being paid any wages for those weeks. Transcript at 34-36.

The employer’s wage records may establish by a preponderance of evidence that claimant earned the remuneration alleged, when weighed against claimant’s inconsistent statements to the contrary. However, as this remuneration was the subject of the amendment to the administrative decision discussed above, all parties should be given an opportunity to present additional evidence on remand as

⁶ The greater of \$300.00, or one-third claimant’s weekly benefit amount ($\$180/3 = \60), is \$300.00. Reducing claimant’s benefit amount dollar-for-dollar for earnings in excess of \$300.00 results in a benefit amount of \$0 ($\$589.50 - \$300.00 = \289.50; $\$180.00 - \$289.50 = <\$0$ for week 27-21) ($\$481.25 - \$300.00 = \$181.25$; $\$180.00 - \$181.25 = <\$0$ for week 28-21).

⁷ The employer stated that they included earnings for March 6, 2021 amounting to \$90.00 (4.5 hours times \$20 per hour = \$90.00) in the \$430.00 total earnings for the period March 6, 2021 through March 14, 2021. EAB Exhibit 1 at 29. Assigning the \$90.00 to week 09-21 (in which March 6, 2021 occurred) instead of week 10-21 results in these totals for weeks 09-21 and 10-21.

to whether claimant earned the wages alleged in the schedule of adjustments in order to determine whether claimant was overpaid for weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21.

Misrepresentation. ORS 657.215 requires that an individual be disqualified from receiving benefits for up to 52 weeks if the individual “willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failed to report a material fact, to obtain any benefits under this chapter.” OAR 471-030-0052 (January 11, 2018) provides in relevant part:

(1) An authorized representative of the Employment Department shall determine the number of weeks of disqualification under ORS 657.215 according to the following criteria:

(a) 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.

(b) When the disqualification is imposed because the disqualifying act(s) under ORS 657.215 relates to the provisions of 657.176, the number of weeks of disqualification shall be the number of weeks calculated in the same manner as under subsection (a) above, or four weeks, whichever is greater.

* * *

ORS 657.310(7) provides: The department will review the number of occurrences of misrepresentation when applying the penalty as described in ORS 657.310(2). An occurrence shall be counted each time an individual willfully makes a false statement or representation, or willfully fails to report a material fact to obtain benefits. The department shall use the date the individual failed to report a material fact or willfully made a false statement as the date of the occurrence. For an individual subject to disqualification by administrative action under 657.215, the penalty will be:

(a) For the first or second occurrence within 5 years of the occurrence for which a penalty is being assessed, 15 percent of the total amount of benefits the individual received but to which the individual was not entitled.

(b) For the third or fourth occurrence within 5 years of the occurrence for which a penalty is being assessed, 20 percent of the total amount of benefits the individual received but to which the individual was not entitled.

(c) For the fifth or sixth occurrence within 5 years of the occurrence for which a penalty is being assessed, 25 percent of the total amount of benefits the individual received but to which the individual was not entitled.

(d) For the seventh or greater occurrence within 5 years of the occurrence for which a penalty is being assessed, 30 percent of the total amount of benefits the individual received but to which the individual was not entitled.

(e) In cases of forgery or identity theft, 30 percent of the amount of benefits the individual received but to which the individual was not entitled.

* * *

The order under review concluded that claimant “could not have made a willful misrepresentation to obtain benefits” because “the record did not establish that claimant was overpaid any benefits[.]” Order No. 23-UI-224944 at 8. The record does not support these conclusions.

As discussed above, further development of the record is needed to determine whether claimant was overpaid benefits for weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21. If claimant was overpaid for any or all of these weeks, the record on remand must be developed to determine whether such overpayments resulted from claimant willfully making a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failing to report a material fact to obtain benefits and, if so, whether a monetary penalty or penalty disqualification should be assessed in accordance with ORS 657.610(7) and 657.215, respectively.

Claimant’s report of earning \$380.00 on her claim for week 12-21, when the record does not show that she worked that week, suggests that claimant may have been attempting to report her earnings for weeks 09-21 and 10-21 which were apparently received during week 12-21.⁸ Such an error could constitute evidence that claimant did not willfully make false statements with regard to those earnings. Further development of the record is therefore needed to determine why, if claimant earned wages during weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, and 28-21, she did not accurately report them on her weekly claims.

On remand, even if claimant is not found to have willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits with regard to reporting remuneration for weeks 09-21, 10-21, 27-21, or 28-21, a determination must still be made as to whether claimant willfully made such statements or failed to report material facts with regard to reporting the March 21, 2021 and August 14, 2021 work separations. This is true even though claimant was not overpaid benefits as a result of those work separations, as penalty disqualifications are not contingent upon whether a claimant was overpaid. If misrepresentation is found, OAR 471-030-0052(1)(b) must be used to calculate the length of the penalty disqualification, because such a misrepresentation would be related to the provisions of ORS 657.176. ORS 657.176 involves disqualifications because of work separations such as being discharged for misconduct or voluntarily quitting work without good cause. *See* ORS 657.176(2)(c). Therefore, under OAR 471-030-0052(1)(b), the number of weeks of disqualification is the number of weeks calculated via the manner set forth by OAR 471-030-0052(1)(a), or four weeks, whichever is greater, resulting in a minimum four-week penalty disqualification in the absence of an overpayment caused by the misrepresentation.

⁸ It also suggests that claimant may have been underpaid \$180.00 in PEUC benefits and \$300.00 in FPUC benefits for that week, if claimant actually had no earnings for the week, which could offset other potential overpayments for the week(s) in which those wages were actually earned.

The record must therefore be further developed on remand as to whether claimant made misrepresentations regarding remuneration or work separations, and whether she is therefore subject to a penalty disqualification. Inquiry should include whether statements made in claimant's claim for benefits for week 12-21 reflected that she was discharged during that week for reasons other than lack of work, as Order No. 23-UI-217187 concluded, and if not, why claimant failed to report that material fact. Similarly, inquiry should be made into claimant's statement in her August 23, 2021 additional claim for benefits that she had been laid off on August 17, 2021 for lack of work, when Order No. 23-UI-217186 concluded that claimant had been discharged for leaving work early.⁹

ORS 657.270 requires the ALJ to give all parties a reasonable opportunity for a fair hearing. That obligation necessarily requires the ALJ to ensure that the record developed at the hearing shows a full and fair inquiry into the facts necessary for consideration of all issues properly before the ALJ in a case. ORS 657.270(3); *see accord Dennis v. Employment Division*, 302 Or 160, 728 P2d 12 (1986). Because further development of the record is necessary for a determination of whether an overpayment or penalties should be assessed, Order No. 23-UI-224944 is reversed, and this matter is remanded.

DECISION: Order No. 23-UI-224944 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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

DATE of Service: July 6, 2023

NOTE: The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Order No. 23-UI-224944 or return this matter to EAB. Only a timely application for review of the subsequent order will cause this 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.

⁹ Though decision # 194245 alleges that claimant misrepresented or failed to report the August 14, 2021 work separation in her claim for benefits for week 34-21, because claimant did not claim benefits during week 32-21 in which the separation occurred, claimant was first required to report details of the separation in the additional claim for benefits she filed August 23, 2021 for week 33-21. *See* OAR 471-030-0040(1)(c) (March 15, 2023) (defining "Additional claim").



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.