

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2023-EAB-0677

Affirmed
Late Request for Hearing Allowed
Ineligible for PUA Weeks 06-20 through 35-21

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On April 7, 2022, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served a Notice of Determination for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) concluding that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits effective March 8, 2020. On April 27, 2022, the April 7, 2022 PUA determination became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On June 9, 2022, claimant filed a late request for hearing. On May 25, 2023, ALJ Lucas conducted a hearing, and on June 1, 2023 issued Order No. 23-UI-226650, allowing claimant’s late request for hearing and modifying the April 7, 2022 PUA determination by concluding that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits from February 2, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 06-20 through 35-21).¹ On June 15, 2023, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

Based on a *de novo* review of the entire record in this case, and pursuant to ORS 657.275(2), the portion of the order under review allowing claimant’s late request for hearing is **adopted**. The rest of this decision addresses claimant’s eligibility for PUA benefits.

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: EAB considered claimant’s argument in reaching this decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) In 2015, claimant’s husband created a page on Yelp as the owner of a business called C.R. Remodeling with an address in Milwaukie, Oregon. The page described the business as “a complete remodeling company” offering “emergency 24 hr service Water breaks, drain

¹ Although Order No. 23-UI-226650 stated that it affirmed the April 7, 2022 PUA determination, it modified that decision by changing the effective date of the disqualification from March 8, 2020 to February 2, 2020. Order No. 23-UI-226650 at 7.

problems, electrical problems, and hot water heater repair and replacement.” Exhibit 4 at 14. C.R. Remodeling was never registered as a business or corporate entity with the Oregon Secretary of State.

(2) From 2015 through September 4, 2021, neither claimant nor her husband held any trade or professional license issued in Oregon, such as licenses to perform electrical, plumbing or construction work. Claimant did not have an Oregon driver license during this time. Neither claimant, nor her husband, nor C.R. Remodeling had been issued a business license or paid business taxes. Similarly, none was covered by a business insurance policy during this time, and none retained any records pertaining to the transactions the business engaged in, such as contracts, receipts, or correspondence with customers.

(3) From 2015 through early March 2020, claimant used her phone to search for and respond to advertisements on Craigslist for “handyman” gig work, to include “repairs, remodeling... drywall, painting, and yardwork.” Transcript at 59. Such work would typically last “between a couple hours to a couple of days” and the customers paid in cash “at the end of every day.” Transcript at 61. When claimant would find a suitable work opportunity, claimant’s husband negotiated the fee for the work, purchased any required materials, “did the bulk of the actual labor,” and “was the one to deal with most of the accounting.” Transcript at 82, 89. Claimant and her husband lived in a van which they also used to travel to work sites. After deducting expenses such as gas and food from the work proceeds, claimant and her husband shared “whatever was leftover” rather than split the profits evenly, because they were “partners romantically as well[.]” Transcript at 94-95. Claimant and her husband did not seek work through means other than responding to Craigslist ads.

(4) On March 8, 2020, a customer who had previously arranged to have C.R. Remodeling paint an apartment on March 10, 2020 canceled the work without explanation. Claimant surmised that because the customer was “in his mid-70s” that he “wanted to be extra cautious due to his age,” and cancelled “for COVID reasons.” Transcript at 63.

(5) After the March 8, 2020 cancellation, claimant felt “there just really wasn’t any” jobs of the type she typically searched for posted on Craigslist from that date through 2022, except for “once in a while maybe there would be one,” but claimant was outbid for the work in those instances. Transcript at 52. Claimant attributed the lack of job postings to customers not wanting people in their homes “due to the pandemic.” Transcript at 52. Neither claimant nor her husband performed work or received remuneration from March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021.

(6) On September 16, 2020, claimant was advised by a doctor to quarantine for two weeks because she “had been potentially exposed to the Coronavirus, via somebody [she] had fairly regular contact with.” Transcript at 64.

(7) On December 24, 2020, claimant filed an initial claim for PUA benefits. She requested that the claim be backdated to February 2, 2020, and claimed benefits for the weeks of February 2, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 06-20 through 35-21). These are the weeks at issue. The Department determined the claim to be valid and paid claimant PUA benefits for the weeks from March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 11-20 through 35-21), but did not pay benefits for the weeks from February 2 through March 7, 2020 (weeks 06-20 through 10-20). Claimant did not report any remuneration for the weeks of February 2 through March 7, 2020 (weeks 06-20 through 10-20) on her

weekly claims.² Claimant was not eligible for regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) benefits, extended benefits (EB), or Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation (PEUC) benefits during the weeks at issue.³

(8) In her initial PUA application, claimant self-certified that she was “unable to reach [her] place of employment because [she had] been advised by a healthcare provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19.” Exhibit 3 at 74. Claimant also self-certified that she was “impacted by the COVID-19 public health emergency” because the March 10, 2020 painting work was “postpone[d] indefinitely.” Exhibit 3 at 76.

(9) On February 23, 2021, claimant received a request from the Department to provide documentary proof of her self-employment. In response, claimant submitted a letter dated April 12, 2021 from her husband stating that claimant had been “subcontracting her services (secretarial) since May 2015 [to C.R. Remodeling]. In 2019 she worked 400 hours and was paid \$30 per hour. In 2020 she worked 20 hours each week at the same rate until March, when we ceased bidding new jobs.” Exhibit 3 at 130.

(10) On May 6, 2021, claimant and her husband registered a limited liability company with the Oregon Secretary of State as “Caroline & Ryan’s Remodeling & Concessions, LLC.” Exhibit 4 at 69. They did this as part of a plan “to revitalize the business” and because “it was also on the list of [] suggested proof of self-employment listed by the Department as well.” Transcript at 52-53.

(11) In approximately September 2021, also in response to the Department’s request for proof of self-employment, claimant filled out federal and Oregon tax return forms for 2019 and provided them to the Department. Claimant believed she filed the returns by mailing them to the Internal Revenue Service prior to sending copies to the Department, but was advised in June 2022 during the Department’s investigation of her claim that neither return had been filed with the state or federal governments. Claimant did not thereafter attempt to file the returns and they remained unfiled as of the May 25, 2023 hearing. The return forms reflected self-employment gross income of \$7,300 and net profit of \$5,200, and listed claimant’s filing status as “Single.” Exhibit 3 at 135, 139. These figures reflected the “combined” total income and profit of the business and not just claimant’s share. Transcript at 76.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant was not eligible for PUA benefits from February 2, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 06-20 through 35-21).

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). The Department paid claimant benefits for weeks 11-20 through 35-21, and therefore had the burden of proving claimant should not have been paid benefits for those weeks. By logical extension of that principle, where benefits have not

² 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.

³ 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.

been paid, claimant has the burden to prove that the Department should have paid benefits. Therefore, claimant had the burden to prove that she should have been paid benefits for weeks 06-20 through 10-20.

To be eligible for PUA benefits, an individual must be a “covered individual” as that term is defined by the CARES Act, as amended. 15 U.S.C. § 9021(b). In pertinent part, a “covered individual” is an individual who (1) “is not eligible for regular compensation or extended benefits . . . or pandemic emergency unemployment compensation” and (2) self-certifies that they are either “otherwise able to work and available to work within the meaning of applicable State law, except the individual is unemployed, partially unemployed, or unable or unavailable to work because” of one of eleven reasons related to the COVID-19 pandemic, or “is self-employed, is seeking part-time employment, does not have sufficient work history, or otherwise would not qualify for regular unemployment” and is rendered unemployed because of one of the eleven listed reasons.⁴ 15 U.S.C. § 9021(a)(3)(A)(i)-(ii). Regulations at 20 C.F.R. part 625, which pertain to the Disaster Unemployment Assistance program, apply to the PUA program, unless otherwise provided or contrary to the Act. 15 U.S.C. § 9021(h).

The COVID-19 related circumstances recognized by the CARES Act that are potentially applicable to this case include the following:

* * *

(ff) the individual is unable to reach the place of employment because the individual has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19;

(gg) the individual was scheduled to commence employment and does not have a job or is unable to reach the job as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency;

* * *

Another of the enumerated COVID-19 related reasons is that “the individual meets any additional criteria established by the [United States] Secretary [of Labor] for unemployment assistance under this section.” 15 U.S.C. § 9021(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I)(kk). A circumstance approved via the Secretary’s item (kk) authority is for “self-employed individuals who experienced a significant diminution of services because of the COVID-19 public health emergency.” U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 16-20, Change 2 (July 21, 2020) at 2.

⁴ There is a third element of “covered individual” status, added to the Act via the Continued Assistance for Unemployed Workers Act of 2020, enacted on December 27, 2020. The third element requires a claimant to provide documentation substantiating their employment or self-employment within a required timeframe. 15 U.S.C. § 9021(a)(3)(A)(iii); U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 16-20, Change 4 (January 8, 2021) (UIPL 16-20, Change 4), at 5 (“Individuals who applied for PUA before January 31, 2021 and receive a payment of PUA on or after December 27, 2020 . . . are required to provide documentation of employment or self-employment[.]”) Because claimant did not meet the second element of “covered individual” status, as discussed below, this decision does not reach the third element of self-employment documentation.

The record does not show that claimant constituted a “covered individual” entitled to PUA benefits during the weeks at issue. Although claimant met the first element of PUA eligibility because she was not eligible for regular unemployment insurance, extended benefits, or PEUC during the weeks at issue, she nevertheless did not constitute a “covered individual” because her circumstances did not satisfy any of the COVID-19 qualifying reasons enumerated under 15 U.S.C. § 9021(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I).

As a preliminary matter, the fact that claimant asserted eligibility consistent only with items (ff) and (gg) in her application does not preclude the additional consideration of eligibility under item (kk). Guidance instructs that PUA claimants are to provide a COVID-19 impact reason or reasons in their initial application and then certify each week that one of the eleven enumerated reasons applies, “even if the precise provision under which he or she initially qualified changes to another precise provision” of the Act. U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 16-20, Change 1 (April 27, 2020) (UIPL 16-20, Change 1) at I-12. Federal guidance also requires weekly claim forms to allow individuals both to select more than one COVID-19 related reason each week and to select different reasons each week. U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 16-20, Change 5 (February 25, 2021) at 10. Thus, federal guidance contemplates that situations will arise in which a claimant will assert multiple COVID-19 impact reasons, as claimant did in this case.

Diminution of services. The record does not show that claimant was a self-employed individual who experienced a significant diminution of services because of the COVID-19 public health emergency, pursuant to the Secretary’s item (kk) authority. The applicable regulation defines “self-employment” as “services performed as a self-employed individual.” 20 C.F.R. Section 625.2(o). Section 625.2(n) defines “self-employed individual” as “an individual whose primary reliance for income is on the performance of services in the individual’s own business, or on the individual’s own farm.” While the record suggests that claimant’s husband may have attempted to start or operate a business in 2015 when he created a Yelp page for it, other circumstantial evidence shows that any such business did not persist in that form in 2019 and beyond. The page itself does not evince any subsequent business-related activity, such as reviews for work done or inquiries by potential customers.⁵ The business was not incorporated or registered with the Secretary of State, did not have a business license or insurance, and did not pay taxes. The only two people potentially associated with the business, claimant and her husband, were not licensed to engage in many of the activities advertised on the Yelp page, such as plumbing, electrical work, and remodeling. Claimant’s testimony further suggested that neither claimant nor her husband were licensed to drive the van out of which the business was alleged to have operated. Transcript at 88. Claimant and her husband did not retain any records pertaining to the transactions the business allegedly engaged in, such as contracts, receipts, or correspondence with customers.

Instead, claimant’s testimony revealed that, as of 2019, rather than soliciting potential customers through the Yelp page or by other means of advertising, work was sought mainly or exclusively by claimant searching “help-wanted” or “gigs” ads on Craigslist and responding to them. Transcript at 58. Claimant’s husband would then typically perform all aspects of the work from negotiating compensation to receiving and accounting for payment after completion of the work. While claimant may have been present at jobsites, perhaps out of necessity if the van they lived in was being utilized for work, she described her role in this enterprise as “definitely a passive role... I guess, just holding things, etcetera.”

⁵ The sole public contribution to the page was a 2017 inquiry as to the husband’s whereabouts that did not purport to be business-related.

Transcript at 58. Such an arrangement lacked nearly every typical characteristic of a business, and essentially amounted to an individual—claimant’s husband—occasionally performing gig work for cash. Though claimant’s assistance in finding her husband gig work may have contributed indirectly to his earnings, which were ultimately shared with claimant as marital income, this did not constitute claimant primarily relying on income from *claimant’s* having performed services in *her own* business. Accordingly, the record does not show that claimant was engaged in self-employment from 2019 through the weeks at issue.

Further, even if this arrangement did constitute self-employment, the record does not demonstrate a significant diminution of services because of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Claimant offered contradictory evidence of earnings during 2019 and 2020. Claimant’s husband’s April 12, 2021 letter to the Department stated that claimant was paid \$30 per hour for 400 hours of “secretarial” work during 2019, which would total \$12,000. Exhibit 3 at 130. In contrast, claimant did not testify that she was paid for any work at an hourly rate, but stated that her primary source of income was the profit from the gig work, which she and her husband shared as romantic partners. Transcript at 61, 94-95. Claimant testified that the gig jobs typically paid an average of \$200 each and that they were performed two to eight hours per day, five days per week on average. Transcript at 49-50. Claimant additionally estimated that, in total, the work paid, on average, \$1,500 per week before expenses. Transcript at 50-51. However, when the ALJ advised claimant that averaging \$1,500 per week would equate to \$78,000 per year, claimant stated that her estimates at hearing were inaccurate and that, “The information on my tax return was correct.” Transcript at 55-56. The unfiled 2019 tax return forms claimant submitted to the Department showed \$7,300 in gross earnings and \$5,200 in net profits, which she testified constituted all of the 2019 income from the gig work, and not just her share. Transcript at 76. The \$7,300 gross earnings equated to an average of less than one \$200 gig per week during 2019, and average gross weekly earnings of \$140.38.⁶

In further contrast to this evidence, the April 12, 2021 letter also stated that claimant “worked 20 hours each week until March [2020]” at the same rate of pay. Exhibit 3 at 130. Assuming claimant worked four weeks per month in January and February 2020, claimant would have earned \$4,800 in this period.⁷ However, claimant reported no earnings to the Department on her claims for the weeks including February 2, 2020 through March 7, 2020.

Accordingly, the record does not contain sufficient reliable evidence to conclude what claimant or her husband earned from gig work, if anything, in the weeks or months preceding the COVID-19 public health emergency. Therefore, it cannot be determined that claimant thereafter suffered a significant diminution of services because of that emergency even if the record shows she had no earnings after March 8, 2020. Claimant denied that she or her husband had any earnings from gig work from March 8, 2020 through at least September 4, 2021. Transcript at 51-52. She reported no earnings on her weekly claims for these weeks.

⁶ \$7,300 yearly gross / \$200 per gig = 36.5 gigs. 36.5 gigs / 52 weeks = 0.7 average gigs per week. \$7,300 / 52 weeks = \$140.38 per week.

⁷ 2 months x 4 weeks per month x 20 hours per week x \$30 per hour = \$4,800

Further, even if the record showed a diminution of services, it does not establish that such a diminution was “because of the COVID-19 public health emergency.” Claimant testified that she did see and respond to some ads on Craigslist from March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021, but that, “[T]here were lots of other people doing the same in competition with me, so I was unable to find any clients.” Transcript at 52. To the extent claimant or her husband were not hired for specific jobs due to competition, this was not attributable to the COVID-19 public health emergency. Claimant asserted that there were fewer postings on Craigslist of gigs to which she could apply, and surmised that this was because, “[T]he vast majority of our work involved having to be inside someone’s home, so due to social distancing, you know, people didn’t really want anyone in their homes [due to the risk of contracting the Novel Coronavirus],” and that this persisted “through 2022.” Transcript at 51-52. However, the April 12, 2021 letter from claimant’s husband simply stated that claimant stopped performing any work for the business when they “ceased bidding new jobs” in March 2020. Exhibit 3 at 130.

It is not unreasonable to infer that fear of COVID-19 might have caused fewer people to post ads for work to be performed in their homes. Yet even if claimant’s testimony, based on her tax forms, of average weekly earnings during 2019 of \$140.38 were accepted and those earnings entirely attributed to *her* labor, it is more likely than not that factors other than the COVID-19 public health emergency reducing the overall number of job postings, such as claimant being outbid on jobs or ceasing to bid on others, caused claimant’s earnings from gig work to average less than \$140.38 per week after March 8, 2020.

Moreover, USDOL guidance suggests that the criteria established under item (kk) apply only to individuals whose unemployment is the “direct result” of the pandemic.⁸ To read this guidance without the “direct result” requirement would result in self-employed individuals or independent contractors being eligible for PUA benefits where employees in otherwise-identical circumstances would be ineligible. The consistent usage of the “direct result” requirement throughout the language of the eligibility criteria of the PUA program, and the lack of any explanation to clarify why self-employed individuals or independent contractors should otherwise be considered eligible on grounds not available to employees—therefore indicates that, more likely than not, USDOL did not intend § 2102(a)(3)(A)(ii)(I)(kk) of the CARES Act to create eligibility for individuals whose unemployment results only indirectly from the pandemic.

Per this guidance, “direct result” as used in 15 U.S.C. § 9021 is defined per 20 C.F.R. 625.5(c) to mean that “the unemployment is an immediate result of the major disaster itself, and not the result of a longer chain of events precipitated or exacerbated by the disaster. Such an individual’s unemployment is a direct result of the major disaster if the unemployment resulted from: (1) The physical damage or destruction of the place of employment; (2) The physical inaccessibility of the place of employment in the major disaster area due to its closure by or at the request of the federal, state or local government, in immediate response to the disaster; or (3) Lack of work, or loss of revenues, provided that, prior to the disaster, the employer, or the business in the case of a self-employed individual, received at least a majority of its revenue or income from an entity in the major disaster area that was either damaged or destroyed in the disaster, or an entity in the major disaster area closed by the federal, state or local government in immediate response to the disaster.”

⁸ U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 16-20 (April 5, 2020) (UIPL 16-20), at 14.

Here, to the extent potential customers' fears of COVID-19 led them to post fewer ads for gig work on Craigslist, leading in turn to increased competition for available work and claimant or her husband being hired for fewer or no jobs, this diminution of work resulted from a "longer chain of events precipitated or exacerbated by" the pandemic, and not the result of the types of events contemplated in 20 C.F.R. 625.5(c). Accordingly, the record does not demonstrate that any diminution of work was "because of the COVID-19 public health emergency."

For these reasons, the record does not show that claimant met the definition of a "covered individual" during the weeks at issue pursuant to the Secretary's item (kk) authority.

Quarantine. The record also fails to show that claimant was a "covered individual" because she was directed by a medical professional to quarantine due to potential COVID-19 exposure. While claimant was, more likely than not, directed to quarantine for this reason for two weeks beginning September 16, 2020, claimant was not employed or engaging in self-employment at the time. The last time claimant or her husband engaged in gig work, if at all, was sometime prior to March 8, 2020. Claimant may have, while quarantined, continued to seek gig work that her husband could perform. However, as explained above, this search for gig work itself did not constitute self-employment. Because claimant had not been employed or self-employed for the six months preceding the quarantine, she was not rendered unemployed or unavailable to work because of the quarantine, and was not a "covered individual" under item (ff) for this reason.

Loss of scheduled employment. The record also fails to show that claimant was a "covered individual" because she was scheduled to commence employment and did not have a job or was unable to reach the job as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Claimant was only able to identify one customer or potential customer with any degree of specificity. Claimant testified that this customer, whose name and general location she provided, had at some point engaged them for services, and at some time prior to March 8, 2020 contacted claimant again and arranged for an apartment to be painted on March 10, 2020. The customer contacted claimant on March 8, 2020, and cancelled the work, apparently without explanation.

As a preliminary matter, the record does not show that claimant, rather than her husband, was scheduled to commence this labor. As claimant typically only searched for work and responded to ads, and in this instance a former customer contacted claimant without posting an ad, it can be inferred that claimant's role in this transaction had concluded prior to it being cancelled. However, even if claimant planned to participate in the painting of the apartment, the record does not show that claimant did not have a job or was unable to reach the job as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Claimant supposed that, due to his advanced age, the customer cancelled the work out of fear of contracting COVID-19. Transcript at 63. However, claimant admitted that this occurred at a time when "[the Governor's] stay-at-home order hadn't been issued yet." Transcript at 63. Given the lack of other corroborating evidence, this was no more likely to be the cause of the cancellation than any number of other reasons, such as the customer lacking resources to pay for the work, finding another painter he preferred, or simply changing his mind about needing the work done. Accordingly, the unexplained cancellation of a single gig job, which claimant likely would not have performed herself, did not establish that claimant was scheduled to commence employment and did not have a job or was unable to reach the job as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Claimant therefore was not a "covered individual" under item (gg).

For the above reasons, claimant was not a covered individual under the CARES Act during the weeks at issue, and therefore is not eligible for PUA benefits for those weeks.

DECISION: Order No. 23-UI-226650 is affirmed.

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

DATE of Service: July 27, 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.

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.