

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2023-EAB-1159**

*Affirmed*  
*Disqualification*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On September 13, 2023, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause and was therefore disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective August 20, 2023 (decision # 71244). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On October 2, 2023, ALJ Toth conducted a hearing, and on October 10, 2023, issued Order No. 23-UI-238207, affirming decision # 71244. On October 17, 2023, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

**EVIDENTIARY MATTER:** EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). The additional evidence consists of 33 pages of documents which claimant submitted, plus a certificate of service, and 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.

**WRITTEN ARGUMENT:** Claimant's argument contained information that was not part of the hearing record, but factors or circumstances beyond claimant's reasonable control prevented her from offering the information during the hearing. *See* ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090. Claimant submitted a 32-page exhibit prior to hearing, which was admitted to evidence as Exhibit 1. For unknown reasons, pages 7-32 of Exhibit 1 appear as duplicates of page 6, rather than the documents claimant submitted. It can reasonably be inferred that claimant's 37-page submission of November 2, 2023, with the exception of pages 1-3 and 24,<sup>1</sup> constituted what claimant attempted to submit as Exhibit 1 at hearing, and that claimant was prevented from offering that information during the hearing due to technological

<sup>1</sup> Though the portion of this submission containing new information totaled 33 pages rather than 32 pages, this is presumed to be due to a variation in font size, as the duplicate submissions of November 2, 2023 and November 3, 2023 varied in page length for that reason.

difficulties beyond her reasonable control. Such information has been admitted as EAB Exhibit 1. Page 24 of the November 2, 2023, submission and pages 1-2 of claimant's November 3, 2023 submission were construed as claimant's written argument, and EAB considered it in reaching this decision. The remainder of claimant's November 3, 2023, submission was duplicative of the November 2, 2023 submission, as was the submission of October 17, 2023 that accompanied claimant's application for review.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) Providence Health Services employed claimant as a pathology support specialist from April 2022 until August 22, 2023.

(2) Claimant has suffered from migraines her entire life. At times, including while working for the employer, this condition left claimant "throwing up" and unable to "walk down a hall without holding on." Transcript at 66.

(3) Throughout her tenure with the employer, claimant frequently missed work due to migraines and other health reasons, sometimes without advance notice to the employer. The employer considered absences without prior approval to be "unexcused" unless an excuse from a medical provider was later provided. Claimant was aware that excessive unexcused absences could subject her to discipline. Claimant provided excuses from her medical providers on many occasions, but still accumulated several unexcused absences.

(4) Claimant did not have training or experience specific to pathology support before the employer hired her, a fact of which the employer was aware. Claimant was therefore to receive on-the-job training from her coworkers. The need for this training led to friction at times between claimant, her coworkers, and her supervisors: while claimant believed that insufficient time was spent training her and that her trainers lacked patience with her, the coworkers and supervisors believed she was not learning some job duties as quickly as they expected. In the summer of 2023, the employer was preparing to implement significant changes to work procedures impacting claimant and her coworkers, which exacerbated this friction.

(5) Throughout her employment with the employer, claimant believed that she was being "harassed" by her coworkers, for reasons that included being older than her coworkers. Transcript at 7.

(6) On an unknown date, claimant was walking down a hallway and a coworker said, "'Can you get outta the way? You're way too slow,' or something to that effect, and. . . 'You're not as young as you used to be.'" Transcript at 53. Claimant did not report this incident to the employer.

(7) At some time after July 25, 2022, claimant wrote to her supervisor to describe an incident that happened on July 25, 2022. She wrote that a coworker raised his voice to claimant while discussing a misunderstanding over a package tracking number. Claimant said to the coworker, "[D]on't ever talk to me like that again[.]" EAB Exhibit 1 at 21. A short time later, the coworker apologized to claimant, explaining that he was "really stressed" by other matters, and claimant told him that she accepted his apology. EAB Exhibit 1 at 21.

(8) On December 21, 2022, claimant wrote to her supervisor that, on that day, a coworker "was sooo snippy I asked her if she would 'please talk to me a little nicer[.]'" EAB Exhibit 1 at 30.

(9) On April 26, 2023, claimant complained in writing to her supervisor that, “It is ‘harassment’ the way everyone in this dept. treats me, I will never be part of ‘THEIR TEAM’. . . ‘I’m so harassed here by all[.]’” EAB Exhibit 1 at 28. Claimant elaborated, “[A coworker] treats me so poorly when she’s teaching me anything. . . I’ve been here almost a year and not once has anyone said anything encouraging me to, [sic] not once. I’m not a child and need to be uplifted every 2 minutes, but a year and nothing!” EAB Exhibit 1 at 28. Claimant further wrote that she “talked to you [her supervisor] several time [sic] about this exact situation[.]” and would therefore bring up the matter with the supervisor’s manager. EAB Exhibit 1 at 28. Claimant met with her supervisor and his manager later that day. Claimant told them that her coworkers made her feel “left out” but did not mention that she felt she “was being treated differently because of her age.” Transcript at 44. When pressed for examples of why she felt left out, claimant reported that her coworkers received email that claimant did not receive, and the coworkers would “bust up laughing at the same time” after reading it. Transcript at 7. Claimant believed the email was about her. Claimant had difficulty providing other specific examples of what she believed to be harassment during the meeting. The supervisors also discussed claimant’s frequent absences from work at the meeting.

(10) As a result of claimant’s April 26, 2023, complaint, the employer’s human resources department initiated an investigation into whether claimant was being harassed or “bullied” by her coworkers. Transcript at 45. The coworkers in question were interviewed in May 2023. At that time, the coworkers reported feeling “harassed” by claimant, and reported that claimant would “speak to them rudely and respond to them rudely.” Transcript at 45. The email claimant complained of not receiving, and at which her coworkers laughed, was revealed to have not involved claimant in any way. The employer concluded that the investigation failed to corroborate claimant’s complaints through documentary evidence or witness accounts. The employer encouraged claimant, however, to document any harassment or bullying and report it directly to human resources. It was discovered through this investigation that claimant had secretly audio-recorded her coworkers, a potential violation of the employer’s policies. The employer initiated an investigation into claimant’s conduct in that regard.

(11) On June 2, 2023, claimant’s supervisor and his manager met with claimant to discuss the results of the investigation into her complaint and other matters. They counseled claimant against further unexcused absences, set forth expectations regarding the pace of training, and requested that she improve her communication and collaboration with coworkers, including not raising her voice to them in frustration. Claimant was dissatisfied with this outcome and felt the training expectations were “unrealistic.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 33.

(12) On August 3, 2023, claimant’s supervisor and his manager met with claimant to present her with a performance improvement plan (PIP). The areas in which improvement was desired mirrored those mentioned in the June 2, 2023, meeting: attendance, training, and interactions with her coworkers. The PIP was presented to claimant in writing, and she signed it on August 10, 2023. The employer did not have plans to discharge claimant at that time or “accelerate any process that might eventually lead to a discharge.” Transcript at 38.

(13) On August 22, 2023, claimant’s coworkers were discussing new procedures being implemented in their department. When someone said, “Huh, yeah, the only one that’s gonna have problems with that is [claimant],” the room “exploded” with laughter. Transcript at 13. Claimant did not report this to the

employer. Approximately two hours into her shift, after this statement was made, claimant texted her supervisor that she was quitting. Claimant finished her scheduled shift and did not work for the employer thereafter. Claimant quit because she felt harassed by her coworkers and due to “health reasons because it was very difficult to work in that environment.” Transcript at 58. Claimant quit “with the anticipation of being let go.” Transcript at 5.

(14) Prior to quitting, claimant did not consider requesting a protected leave of absence under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), or the state law equivalent, because she had applied twice previously but was denied since she was 13.04 hours short of having worked the requisite number of hours for those laws to be applicable. Claimant was excused from work by her medical provider for some days leading up to the day she quit, due to migraines. Claimant’s medical provider was aware of claimant’s unhappiness regarding her employment but did not make recommendations regarding seeking additional leave, workplace accommodations, or separating from employment.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause.

A claimant who leaves work voluntarily is disqualified from the receipt of benefits unless they prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that they had good cause for leaving work when they did. ORS 657.176(2)(c); *Young v. Employment Department*, 170 Or App 752, 13 P3d 1027 (2000). “Good cause . . . is such that a reasonable and prudent person of normal sensitivity, exercising ordinary common sense, would leave work.” OAR 471-030-0038(4) (September 22, 2020). “[T]he reason must be of such gravity that the individual has no reasonable alternative but to leave work.” OAR 471-030-0038(4). The standard is objective. *McDowell v. Employment Department*, 348 Or 605, 612, 236 P3d 722 (2010). Claimant had chronic migraines, a permanent or long-term “physical or mental impairment” as defined at 29 CFR §1630.2(h). A claimant with an impairment who quits work must show that no reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with such an impairment would have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time.

Claimant had multiple interrelated reasons for quitting work when she did: she felt harassed by her coworkers, particularly regarding her age; she was frequently absent due to health issues, including migraines; and she was anticipating being discharged by the employer. As explained in greater detail below, none of claimant’s reasons for quitting, either singly or in combination, constituted a situation of such gravity that no reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with an impairment such as claimants would have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time.

Claimant testified that the final incident of what she felt was age-related harassment was her coworker’s August 22, 2023, comment that claimant would be the “only one” to have problems adjusting to the employer’s new procedures. Transcript at 13. Claimant did not report this incident to the employer. Claimant also testified to a prior incident where she was walking down a hallway and a coworker said, “‘Can you get outta the way? You’re way too slow,’ or something to that effect, and. . . ‘You’re not as young as you used to be.’” Transcript at 53. Claimant testified she “must have” told her supervisor about this incident, but was “not 100% sure.” Transcript at 54. Claimant also testified that her coworkers received email that claimant did not receive, and the coworkers would “bust up laughing at the same time” after reading it. Transcript at 7. Claimant asserted at hearing that she “found out after the fact” that the email was “about [claimant], and about being old.” Transcript at 7. Claimant complained to her

supervisor about the email and laughter, and the supervisor testified that after investigation the employer determined that the email in question had “no context or indication that involved the claimant.” Transcript at 35-36. Claimant additionally testified she complained to her supervisor “several times” that she was “being treated unfairly based on age,” but could not recall any specific time that she made such a report, and could not recall the details of any specific incident that she reported to him. Transcript at 52-53.

In contrast to claimant’s testimony, claimant’s supervisor testified that “there was never any time during claimant’s employment that [he] was aware that [claimant] felt she was being harassed or discriminated against based on her age.” Transcript at 34. The supervisor’s manager similarly testified that claimant never mentioned to her that she felt she was being treated differently because of her age. Transcript at 44. As the evidence regarding whether claimant reported any instances of age-related harassment or discrimination to her supervisor is no more than equally balanced, claimant has not shown by a preponderance of evidence that she made such a report, and the facts have been found accordingly. Similarly, the evidence regarding whether claimant was the subject of the email that caused her coworkers to laugh was no more than equally balanced, and claimant therefore likewise failed to meet the burden of proof that she was harassed in that incident.

While the August 22, 2023, comment and the “hallway” comment negatively referenced claimant’s age and could potentially have given rise to a grave situation if ignored by the employer and allowed to continue unabated, the record shows that, more likely than not, the employer had no knowledge of these incidents or any other age-related harassment toward claimant. The record further suggests that claimant understood the employer was willing to investigate incidents of this nature and take appropriate action if she provided sufficient detail of the incidents, yet she did not report them. Because claimant has not shown by a preponderance of evidence that she faced age-related harassment of a type that warranted providing details to the employer specific enough to investigate, she did not demonstrate that she faced a grave situation due to perceived age-related harassment.

Claimant also quit work due to feeling harassed by conduct that was not, either explicitly or implicitly, related to her age. The record shows that claimant reported to her supervisor an incident which occurred on July 25, 2022. However, that incident amounted to little more than a coworker raising his voice to her during a minor disagreement and apologizing a short time later. Similarly, claimant mentioned that a coworker was “snippy” with her on December 21, 2022, but did not provide sufficient detail about the incident to alert the employer that it could have in any way constituted harassment. Claimant’s April 26, 2023, message to the employer that she was being harassed prompted an investigation by the employer, but when asked on that date for details on why “she felt left out of the group,” or felt harassed, a manager testified she was “unable to provide specific examples” for the employer to investigate. Transcript at 33. The general examples claimant did give, according to that manager’s testimony, was that “upon greeting a fellow caregiver in the morning, she felt the response of, you know, ‘hello’ or ‘good morning’ was not met with the appropriate amount of enthusiasm.” Transcript at 35. The manager also testified that claimant gave the example of the coworkers laughing at email which, as discussed above, claimant failed to prove by a preponderance of evidence had anything to do with her. Transcript at 35. Claimant additionally complained that “when she was doing the work, she would ask a question... how to do something and then not liking the response.” Transcript at 50.

Claimant did not rebut the employer's testimony regarding what examples of harassment she provided at this meeting. Such examples were generally consistent with claimant's written complaint that prompted the meeting, in which she wrote she was unhappy with her trainer's treatment of her, despite having learned "A LOT" from her, and suggested that what she considered harassment mostly consisted of not receiving sufficient encouragement or accolades from her coworkers. EAB Exhibit 1 at 31 (emphasis in original). The employer nonetheless investigated these incidents and complaints and concluded that claimant had not been harassed and was not "either the butt of humor [or] an antagonistic tone" by her coworkers. Transcript at 36. While claimant may subjectively have had reason to find working with her coworkers unpleasant, she did not demonstrate through the examples provided to the employer or evidence in the record that the unpleasantness was such that no reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with an impairment such as claimants would have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time for that reason. Accordingly, claimant has not met her burden of showing that she faced a grave situation due to harassment by coworkers.

Claimant also cited her chronic migraines as a reason for quitting work when she did. While claimant described severe symptoms, such as vomiting and difficulty walking, that she suffered at times as a result of this condition, the record does not demonstrate that the migraines increased in frequency or severity during claimant's employment. The employer had an attendance policy that limited the number of "unexcused absences" allowed, which they defined as an unplanned absence due to illness. Transcript at 40. Under the policy, such absences could retroactively be excused with a note from a treating medical provider. Claimant was warned by the employer on multiple occasions during 2023 about having accumulated an excessive number of unexcused absences, including in the August 10, 2023, PIP. It can reasonably be inferred from the record that claimant would have continued to be unpredictably absent from work due to her migraines, despite warnings from the employer regarding her attendance. However, the record also shows that the employer accepted written excuses from claimant's medical providers on numerous occasions, suggesting that claimant could have continued to have such absences excused in the same manner going forward without violating the employer's attendance policy.

Additionally, while claimant's previous FMLA applications were rejected by the employer's administrator, the reason they were rejected was claimant having not worked the minimum number of hours to qualify for the law's protections. However, in the May 18, 2023, and June 5, 2023 rejection letters, the administrator stated that claimant was only 13.04 hours short of the requirement, which suggested that a subsequent application would not have been rejected for that reason if resubmitted shortly thereafter. EAB Exhibit 1 at 11, 15. Because claimant has not demonstrated that the employer would not allow her to continue missing work as necessary for her medical condition, she has failed to show that no reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with an impairment such as claimants would have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time on that basis. Accordingly, claimant has not met her burden to show that she faced a grave situation due to her health condition.

Finally, claimant asserted at hearing that she quit "with the anticipation of being let go." Transcript at 5. A claimant has good cause to quit work to avoid being discharged, not for misconduct, when the discharge was imminent, inevitable, and would be the "kiss of death" to claimant's future job prospects. *McDowell v. Employment Dep't.*, 348 Or 605, 236 P3d 722 (2010). A future discharge does not need to be certain for a quit to avoid it to qualify as good cause; likelihood is not dispositive of the issue, but it

does bear on the gravity of the situation. *Dubrow v. Employment Dep't.*, 242 Or App 1, 252 P3d 857 (2011). Claimant has not shown that she faced a discharge that was imminent or inevitable at the time she quit.

The employer presented claimant with a PIP on August 10, 2023, suggesting that the employer wanted to work with claimant on areas in which she needed improvement so that they could continue to employ her. Claimant quit less than two weeks later, on August 22, 2023. While the precise terms of the PIP are not in the record, it can be inferred from previous meetings regarding claimant's performance that the plan required that claimant provide excuses from medical providers in accordance with the attendance policy following any unplanned absences due to illness, or obtain approval for FMLA leave; that she refrain from raising her voice or responding rudely to coworkers; and that she learn certain job tasks according to an established timeline. The record does not suggest that claimant believed she would have difficulty either in obtaining medical excuses for absences or responding appropriately to coworkers, as she had provided many such excuses in the past, and denied ever responding inappropriately to coworkers. Transcript at 57. Claimant raised concerns prior to the PIP's issuance that she was "set up to fail" regarding the employer's training expectations. EAB Exhibit 1 at 24. It can therefore reasonably be inferred that claimant had similar skepticism of her ability to meet the PIP's training expectations. Nonetheless, the record shows the employer had no intention of discharging claimant or laying the groundwork to eventually discharge her, and presumably allowed claimant far more than two weeks under the terms of the PIP to demonstrate the desired progress in her training. It is therefore possible that claimant, despite her skepticism, could have met the employer's training expectations as set forth in the PIP, along with the other expectations for improvement. Accordingly, claimant has not established that a discharge was imminent or inevitable, and she therefore did not face a grave situation regarding the prospect of being discharged.

For the reasons stated herein, claimant has failed to meet her burden of establishing by a preponderance of evidence that she faced a situation of such gravity that no reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with an impairment such as claimants would have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time. Therefore, claimant has not shown good cause for quitting work when she did.

Accordingly, claimant voluntarily left work without good cause and is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective August 20, 2023.

**DECISION:** Order No. 23-UI-238207 is affirmed.

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

**DATE of Service:** December 1, 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.

