

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2023-EAB-0837**

*Affirmed*  
*Overpayment and Penalties*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On April 20, 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 a \$15,990 overpayment of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) benefits, a \$21,000 overpayment of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) benefits, a \$1,800 overpayment of Lost Wages Assistance (LWA) benefits, and a \$5,548.50 monetary penalty. On May 10, 2022, the April 20, 2022 administrative decision became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On June 9, 2022, claimant filed a late request for hearing. ALJ Kangas considered claimant's request, and on September 28, 2022 issued order 22-UI-203674, dismissing the request as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the request by responding to an appellant questionnaire by October 12, 2022.

On October 18, 2022, claimant filed a late response to the appellant questionnaire and a timely application for review of Order No. 22-UI-203674 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB). On January 14, 2023, ALJ Kangas mailed a letter stating that the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) would not consider claimant's questionnaire response or issue another order regarding this matter because the questionnaire response was late. On March 17, 2023, EAB issued EAB Decision 2023-EAB-0277, reversing Order No. 22-UI-203674, allowing claimant's late request for hearing, and remanding the matter for a hearing on the merits of the April 20, 2022 administrative decision. On July 6, 2023, ALJ Lucas conducted a hearing, and on July 14, 2023 issued Order No. 23-UI-230526, affirming the April 20, 2022 administrative decision. On July 31, 2023, claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 23-UI-230526 with EAB.

**WRITTEN ARGUMENT:** EAB considered claimant's written argument in reaching this decision.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) On December 24, 2020, claimant filed an initial application for PUA benefits. In that application, when asked to list all employment or self-employment during the last 18 months, claimant stated that she was self-employed from June 10, 2019 to December 25, 2020. Exhibit 2 at 38. Claimant answered “Yes” to the question, “Were you scheduled to start a new job and do not have a job or unable to reach the job as a direct result of the COVID-19 public health emergency?” and stated that the date she was expected to start work was March 10, 2020, that the date the “new job closed” was March 8, 2020, and that the name of the business was “C.R. Remodeling.” Exhibit 2 at 39. Claimant further stated that, “My husband and I own, manage and work for C.R. Remodeling, and we perform repairs and remodeling[.]” Exhibit 2 at 42. She also stated that the business had four clients. Exhibit 2 at 42. Claimant answered “Yes” to the question, “At the time of the pandemic, was this self-employment your primary occupation and primary means of livelihood?” Exhibit 2 at 41. Claimant also certified that she was “currently impacted by the COVID-19 public health emergency” and explained, “I was supposed to start a job renovating and painting an apartment on March 10, but my client contacted me on March 8 to postpone indefinitely due to the state of emergency prompted by COVID-19[.]” Exhibit 2 at 43. Based on claimant’s statements in this application, the Department determined that claimant established a valid claim for PUA benefits effective March 8, 2020 with a minimum weekly benefit amount of \$205.

(2) Claimant filed weekly claims, and the Department paid claimant benefits, for the weeks from March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 11-20 through 35-21). These are the weeks at issue. Claimant received \$205 in PUA benefits each week for a total of \$15,990; \$600 in FPUC benefits each week for weeks 14-20 through 30-20, and \$300 each week for weeks 53-20 through 35-21, totaling \$21,000; and \$300 each week in LWA benefits for weeks 31-20 through 36-20, totaling \$1,800. Claimant did not report any earnings on her weekly claims.

(3) On February 23, 2021, claimant received an email from the Department requiring her to provide verifiable documentary evidence of her self-employment from January 1, 2019 through the effective date of her claim, or she would no longer be eligible for PUA benefits. Exhibit 2 at 67-68. Specifically, claimant was required to provide evidence that she was actively engaged in operating her business, C.R. Remodeling, during this period as her primary source of income, and that the business closed on March 8, 2020 as a direct result of COVID-19—the basis on which claimant had been found eligible for PUA benefits as of the effective date of her claim.

(4) On April 12, 2021, in response to the February 23, 2021 email, claimant submitted a letter from her romantic and business partner<sup>1</sup> which stated, “My company, C.R. Remodeling, has been subcontracting [claimant’s] services (secretarial) since May 2015. 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 2 at 69.

(5) The Department conducted an investigation using governmental and public records in an effort to verify the existence of “C.R. Remodeling” during 2019 and 2020. “C.R. Remodeling” has never been

---

<sup>1</sup> Claimant variously referred to this person as her “husband” or “partner” at different stages of her claim and appeals. Transcript at 14-15. He is referred to as claimant’s partner in the rest of this decision.

registered as a business with the Oregon Secretary of State.<sup>2</sup> Neither claimant nor her partner has been licensed in Oregon to perform remodeling or other contracting work. A page created on the Yelp website for “C.R. Remodeling” showed its most recent activity was a November 18, 2015 post by claimant’s partner.

(6) On April 7, 2022, the Department served a Notice of Determination for PUA, concluding that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits for the weeks from March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 11-20 through 35-21) because she “did not prove self-employment” and “misrepresented facts in order to obtain benefits.” Exhibit 2 at 26. Claimant appealed, and on June 1, 2023, Order No. 23-UI-226650 was issued, modifying the April 7, 2022 PUA determination by concluding that claimant was ineligible for PUA for the weeks from February 2, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 06-20 through 35-21). Claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 23-UI-226650 with EAB, and on July 27, 2023 EAB issued EAB Decision 2023-EAB-0677, affirming Order No. 23-UI-226650.

(7) Claimant knew through correspondence from the Department and from attending various hearings on her appeals related to this claim that the Department remained “willing at any point to accept evidence” from claimant to corroborate her purported self-employment, including through the July 6, 2023 hearing date. Transcript at 22-23.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant willfully made a misrepresentation to obtain \$15,990 in PUA, \$21,000 in FPUC, and \$1,800 in LWA benefits to which she was not entitled and must repay, and is assessed a \$5,548.50 monetary penalty.

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.* 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).

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. In addition, an individual who has been disqualified from 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).

Likewise, “[w]ithin the context of the CARES Act, states must apply a minimum 15 percent monetary penalty to an individual’s overpayment when the state determines that such an overpayment was made to an individual due to fraud.” U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 20-21 (May 5, 2021) (UIPL 20-21), at 4. “Fraud includes instances where an individual knowingly has made . . . a false statement or representation of a material fact[.]” UIPL 20-21 at 4-5. “This fraud penalty is

---

<sup>2</sup> While “C.R. Remodeling” was never registered, the record shows that claimant and her partner registered “Caroline & Ryan’s Remodeling & Concessions, LLC” with the Secretary of State on May 6, 2021, after the Department’s February 23, 2021 request for evidence of the business’s existence. Exhibit 2 at 72.

applicable to PUA, FPUC, MEUC, PEUC and the first week of regular UC that is reimbursed in accordance with Section 2105 of the CARES Act.” UIPL 20-21 at 5.  
20 C.F.R. 625.14 (June 21, 2006) provides, in relevant part:

(a) If the State agency of the applicable State finds that an individual has received a payment of [PUA] to which the individual was not entitled under the Act and this part, whether or not the payment was due to the individual's fault or misrepresentation, the individual shall be liable to repay to the applicable State the total sum of the payment to which the individual was not entitled, and the State agency shall take all reasonable measures authorized under any State law or Federal law to recover for the account of the United States the total sum of the payment to which the individual was not entitled.

\* \* \*

(i) Disqualification for fraud. Any individual who, with respect to a major disaster, makes or causes another to make a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails or causes another to fail to disclose a material fact, in order to obtain for the individual or any other person a payment of [PUA] to which the individual or any other person is not entitled, shall be disqualified as follows:

(1) If the false statement, misrepresentation, or nondisclosure pertains to an initial application for [PUA]—

(i) The individual making the false statement, misrepresentation, or nondisclosure shall be disqualified from the receipt of any [PUA.]<sup>3</sup>

\* \* \*

OAR 471-030-0052 (January 11, 2018) provides, in relevant part:

\* \* \*

(7) 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 9023(h)(1) and (2) provide: Except as otherwise provided in this section or to the extent there is a conflict between this section and part 625 of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, such part 625 shall apply to this section as if the term "COVID-19 public health emergency" were substituted for the term "major disaster" each place it appears in such part 625; and the term "pandemic" were substituted for the term "disaster" each place it appears in such part 625.

\* \* \*

**Overpayment of PUA benefits.** The record shows that the Department paid claimant a total of \$15,990 in PUA benefits for the weeks of March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 11-20 through 35-21). The April 7, 2022 PUA determination asserted, in part, that claimant “did not prove self-employment.” Exhibit 2 at 26. The requirement that a claimant provide proof of self-employment as a condition of PUA eligibility generally may only result in an overpayment being assessed if the claimant fails to do so for the weeks from December 27, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 53-20 through 35-21).<sup>4</sup> However, based on information obtained through their request for proof of self-employment, the Department further alleged in the April 7, 2022 PUA determination that claimant was ineligible for PUA during the entirety of her claim because she “misrepresented facts” in self-certifying that she had been self-employed. Exhibit 2 at 26. The April 7, 2022 PUA determination’s conclusion that claimant was ineligible for PUA for the weeks from March 8, 2020 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 11-20 through 35-21) has been affirmed by EAB on appeal. Accordingly, it has been established as a matter of law that claimant was not entitled to the \$15,990 in PUA benefits she received and was overpaid that amount. As explained in greater detail below, claimant was overpaid these benefits because she willfully made a misrepresentation in her initial application for PUA benefits. Therefore, pursuant to ORS 657.310(1), claimant is required to repay those benefits to the Department or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to her under ORS chapter 657.

**Repayment of FPUC Benefits.** Under the provisions of the CARES Act, 15 U.S.C. § 9023, claimant also received \$21,000 in FPUC benefits to which she was not entitled because she was not eligible for PUA benefits under state law as explained above. *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.”). Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 9023(f)(2), an individual who receives FPUC payments to which the individual was not entitled is liable to repay those benefits, unless the Department waives such repayment because it determines that the payment of those benefits was without fault on the part of the individual and such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. Because claimant was at fault for the PUA benefits overpayment and, in turn, the FPUC benefits overpayment, the Department may not waive repayment. Accordingly, claimant is required to repay the \$21,000 overpayment of FPUC benefits to the Department.

**Repayment of LWA Benefits.** Claimant also received \$1,800 in LWA benefits during the weeks at issue to which she was not entitled because she was not eligible for PUA benefits or benefits under state law as explained above. Repayment of LWA overpayments is governed by the provisions of Section

---

<sup>4</sup> “Individuals who do not provide documentation substantiating employment/self-employment (or planned employment/self-employment) within the required timeframe . . . are not eligible for PUA[.] However, as provided in Section 241(b)(2) of the Continued Assistance Act, for PUA, if the individual fails to submit such documentation, the state may only establish an overpayment for those weeks of unemployment ending on or after December 27, 2020 (the enactment date of the Continued Assistance Act).” U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 16-20, Change 4 (January 8, 2021) at I-11. However, UIPL No. 16-20, Change 4 further states, “When investigating the potential for fraud and improper payments, the state has, and is encouraged to use, [the] authority to request supporting documentation about [the COVID-19 related reason the claimant alleges as the basis of PUA eligibility].” UIPL No. 16-20, Change 4 at I-9.

262(b) of the Continued Assistance for Unemployed Workers Act of 2020. That section provides that an individual who receives LWA payments to which the individual was not entitled is liable to repay those benefits, unless the Department waives such repayment because it determines that the payment of those benefits was without fault on the part of the individual and such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. Because claimant was at fault for the PUA benefits overpayment and, in turn, the LWA benefits overpayment, the Department may not waive repayment. Accordingly, claimant is required to repay the \$1,800 overpayment of LWA benefits to the Department.

**Misrepresentation.** The Department initially determined that claimant was eligible for PUA benefits because she represented that she co-owned and operated a business named “C.R. Remodeling” as her primary source of income from at least June 10, 2019 through December 24, 2020, the date of her initial PUA application. While the record suggests that claimant’s partner may have operated or attempted to operate a remodeling business under that name in 2015, the Department has shown by a preponderance of evidence that claimant did not own or operate such a business from June 10, 2019 through December 24, 2020. “C.R. Remodeling” was not registered in Oregon as a business, and there exists no reliable evidence that it advertised or solicited customers after 2015. Neither claimant nor her partner were licensed as contractors as necessary to operate a remodeling business. A thorough investigation by the Department turned up no publicly available information verifying the existence of the business or claimant’s involvement in it in 2019 or 2020. Claimant was given in excess of two years during the pendency of her claim and various appeals to present any verifiable evidence of the existence of this business and claimant’s participation in it, such as emails or other records of correspondence, receipts, invoices, bank records, insurance policies, tax return transcripts, business licenses, advertisements, client lists, or affirmations from disinterested witnesses, none of which claimant was able to provide. Claimant offered in rebuttal that she no longer had access to the email account used when operating the business, relevant ads were too old to be retrieved from Craigslist, and she did not know how to go about locating records from her prepaid phone. Transcript at 31-32. However, these explanations do not account for the complete lack of evidence of the business’s existence in 2019 and 2020 when at least some reliable evidence should logically have existed if a remodeling business was actually in operation at that time.

Further, the inference that claimant did not own and operate the business alleged during the period stated in her application is not only supported by a lack of evidence that she logically should have been able to provide the Department upon request, but is also supported by her own testimony. Claimant described her “involvement in” the purported business as little more than periodically looking through help wanted ads in the “gigs” section of Craigslist for odd jobs that her partner might perform for cash, and occasionally providing negligible assistance while he performed those jobs. Transcript at 18-19. These efforts did not objectively constitute operation of a remodeling business, particularly with respect to claimant. The record shows by a preponderance of evidence that claimant knew that these actions did not constitute the operation of a remodeling business, as she did not represent them to be a business by registering “C.R. Remodeling” with the Secretary of State; obtaining required occupational licenses for herself or her partner to perform remodeling or other contracting work; securing necessary business licenses and insurance; paying taxes on behalf of the business; or reporting her share of the business income on a filed personal tax return. It can therefore be inferred that the only purpose for which claimant represented that her activities seeking gigs for her partner constituted owning and operating “C.R. Remodeling” was to obtain PUA benefits, and that claimant knew when making that representation that she did not own or operate such a business.

Moreover, when the Department advised claimant in 2021 that in order to remain eligible for PUA benefits, she was required to provide evidence substantiating her pre-pandemic self-employment as claimed in her initial application for PUA benefits, the record shows that claimant submitted a document from her partner which she knew contained false statements regarding the purported business. Claimant testified that prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, she would see “two to three to fifteen different postings that I could, uh, apply for us to do” in the “gigs” section of Craigslist, though she did not specify in what period of time she would see this number of postings. Transcript at 21. Applying to these ads on her partner’s behalf was largely the extent of claimant’s involvement in the purported business activity, according to claimant’s testimony. However, the document claimant submitted to the Department, written by her partner, stated in relevant part, “My company, C.R. Remodeling, has been subcontracting [claimant’s] services (secretarial) since May 2015. 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 [2020.]” Exhibit 2 at 69.

Other than by presenting this document to the Department, claimant has at no point asserted that she was “subcontracted” or paid an hourly wage for “secretarial” or any other work by her partner or “C.R. Remodeling.” Her testimony does not suggest that she spent 20 hours each week on her gig-seeking activities at any point in time. It similarly does not suggest that she had received from her partner \$12,000 in 2019, and \$600 per week in 2020 until March 8, 2020, as compensation for her gig-seeking activities. It can therefore be inferred that the letter’s assertions regarding claimant’s employment relationship with her partner or “C.R. Remodeling” as a subcontractor, as well as her rate of pay, hours worked, and compensation received, were false, and claimant knew these assertions were false when she submitted the document. That claimant resorted to submitting this document, knowing the falsity of the statements it contained, in an effort to prove the existence of the purported business and her involvement in it, is further evidence that claimant knew the statements she provided in her initial PUA application regarding self-employment were false. Accordingly, the Department has met their burden of showing that claimant willfully misrepresented a material fact in order to obtain benefits in her initial application for PUA benefits.<sup>5</sup>

Because claimant was overpaid benefits as a result of having made a willful misrepresentation, claimant is required to repay the overpayment to the Department and is subject to a monetary penalty pursuant to ORS 657.310(2). The \$1,800 overpayment of LWA benefits is not included in the calculation of the monetary penalty pursuant to UIPL 20-21. As the record does not show more than two instances of misrepresentation, the minimum monetary penalty of 15% pursuant to OAR 471-030-0052(7)(a) is applicable to the PUA and FPUC overpayments, which total \$36,990. Accordingly, claimant is required to pay a monetary penalty of \$5,548.50.

For these reasons, claimant willfully made a misrepresentation to obtain benefits and therefore was overpaid \$15,990 in PUA benefits, \$21,000 in FPUC benefits, and \$1,800 in LWA benefits that claimant is required to repay to the Department. Additionally, claimant is required to pay a \$5,548.50 monetary penalty to the Department.

---

<sup>5</sup> Because the misrepresentation “pertains to an initial application for” PUA, claimant is disqualified from the receipt of *any* PUA benefits on that basis. 20 C.F.R. 625.14(i)(1)(1). Therefore, claimant was overpaid as a result of the misrepresentation with respect to all weeks of her claim, even if she had asserted, without misrepresentation or false statement, another basis to qualify for PUA benefits.

**DECISION:** Order No. 23-UI-230526 is affirmed.

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

**DATE of Service:** September 12, 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](https://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](http://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.