

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2023-EAB-1186**

*Affirmed*  
*No Disqualification*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On October 11, 2022, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was disqualified from receiving benefits for the weeks from September 25, 2022 through October 1, 2022 (week 39-22) and until the reason for the disqualification ended, because claimant was unemployed due to a labor dispute that was in active progress (decision # 143240). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On September 21, 2023, ALJ Mott conducted a hearing. On October 4, 2023, ALJ Mott issued Order No. 23-UI-237692, reversing decision # 143240 by concluding that claimant was not disqualified from receiving benefits for the weeks from September 25, 2022 through October 8, 2022 (weeks 39-22 through 40-22) because claimant was unemployed due to a lockout and therefore not subject to the disqualifying effect of ORS 657.200(1). On October 24, 2023, the Department and the employer filed applications for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) Weyerhaeuser Company employed claimant as a log truck driver beginning April 8, 2020. Claimant was represented by a union, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW), Local 246. Claimant's wages and benefits were governed by the terms of a contract between the employer and IAMAW.

(2) On May 31, 2022, the contract between claimant's union and the employer expired. Thereafter, the union and the employer attempted to negotiate a new contract regarding the wages and benefits of the employer's union-represented employees.

(3) Negotiations between the employer and the union were unsuccessful and, on September 13, 2022, the union began a strike against the employer.

(4) After the strike began, the employer locked their gates, blocked equipment, and did not allow union-represented employees to enter the premises other than to retrieve personal items. The employer would not allow union-represented employees who wanted to work during the strike to do so. If a union-represented employee had asked the employer to be allowed to work while the strike was ongoing, the employer would have declined to allow the employee to work and advised that they speak with their union representative.

(5) Claimant worked for the employer at a facility located near Goshen, Oregon. Claimant was a member of the union but did not participate in meetings or vote on union matters. Claimant was unaware that a strike had been called and arrived to work at the usual time for her shift on September 13, 2022. Claimant discovered that the gates were locked and a picket line had formed. Claimant went home and did not work.

(6) Claimant lived “paycheck to paycheck” and needed income to support herself. Transcript at 28. For a time after the strike began, claimant picketed in order to receive strike payments from the union. Claimant found that the strike payment of \$150 per week was insufficient to meet her needs and eventually stopped picketing.

(7) If the employer had allowed union-represented employees to work during the strike, claimant would have done so.

(8) On September 27, 2022, claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits. Claimant claimed benefits for the weeks including September 25, 2022, through October 8, 2022 (weeks 39-22 through 40-22). These are the weeks at issue. The Department did not pay claimant benefits for the weeks at issue.

(9) After claimant filed her initial claim for benefits, the Department sent her a labor dispute questionnaire. Claimant answered the questions contained in the questionnaire and returned the document to the Department. Among other questions, the questionnaire asked, “Did you refuse to cross the picket line?” to which claimant answered “Yes.” Transcript at 9. Claimant answered “Yes” to this question because the employer’s gates were locked, and she could not cross the picket line.

(10) Shortly after October 13, 2022, claimant started working for another employer to support herself while the strike was ongoing. On October 28, 2022, IAMAW concluded its strike against the employer and the lockout by the employer was ended. Thereafter, claimant gave her new employer two weeks’ notice of her intent to quit and then resumed working for the employer in this case.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant was unemployed due to a lockout under ORS 657.200(3)(b) that rendered the disqualifying provision of ORS 657.200(1) inapplicable and so was not disqualified from receiving benefits for the weeks at issue.

ORS 657.200(1) provides that “[a]n individual is disqualified for benefits for any weeks with respect to which [the Department] finds that the unemployment of the individual is due to a labor dispute that is in

active progress at the factory, establishment or other premises at which the individual is or was last employed or at which the individual claims employment rights by union agreement or otherwise.” Under OAR 471-030-0097 (January 11, 2018), “The term ‘labor dispute’ as used in the Employment Department law means any concerted or deliberate action by two or more individuals or by an employing unit resulting in either a strike or lockout in which wages, hours, working conditions or terms or employment of the individuals are involved.”

Although ORS 657.200(1) has the effect of disqualifying an individual from receiving benefits for weeks of unemployment for which the elements of ORS 657.200(1) are met, ORS 657.200(3)(a) provides as follows:

(3) This section does not apply if it is shown to the satisfaction of the director that the individual:

(a) Is unemployed due to a lockout, as defined in ORS 662.205, at the factory, establishment or other premises at which the individual was last employed[.]

ORS 662.205(4) defines “Lockout” to mean “any refusal by an employer to permit employees to work as a result of a dispute with such employees affecting wages, hours or other terms or conditions of their employment.”

Thus, if claimant’s unemployment during the weeks at issue was due to a strike, it was due to a labor dispute in active progress and, under ORS 657.200(1), claimant would be disqualified from receiving benefits for the weeks at issue. If, instead, claimant’s unemployment during the weeks as issue was due to a lockout, it too would meet the OAR 471-030-0097 definition of a labor dispute, but would satisfy the elements of ORS 657.200(3)(a), which renders the disqualifying effect of ORS 657.200(1) inapplicable and therefore would result in claimant not being disqualified from receiving benefits for the weeks at issue.

The Oregon Court of Appeals has held that, for purposes of ORS 657.200(1), the words “due to a labor dispute” means “caused by a labor dispute.” *Barrier v. Employment Division*, 29 Or. App. 387, 391, 563 P.2d 1230, 1232 (1976) (citing *Skookum Co. v. Employment Division*, 24 Or. App. 271, 545 P.2d 914 (1976)). Under these precedents, it is not sufficient to meet the disqualifying provision of ORS 657.200(1) “if the unemployment merely occurred during the course of a strike.” *Barrier*, 29 Or. App. at 391.

Here, more likely than not, claimant’s unemployment during the weeks at issue was caused by the employer’s lockout, not the union’s strike. After the strike began, the employer locked their gates, blocked equipment, and did not allow union-represented employees to enter the premises other than to retrieve personal items. The employer would not allow union-represented employees who wanted to work during the strike to do so. If a union-represented employee had asked the employer to be allowed to work while the strike was ongoing, the employer would have declined to allow the employee to work and advised that they speak with their union representative. The employer’s conduct therefore amounted to a refusal to permit employees to work as a result of a dispute affecting terms or conditions of employment, and accordingly amounted to a lockout as defined by ORS 662.205(4).

The record evidence shows that it was the employer’s lockout that caused claimant’s unemployment during the weeks at issue, notwithstanding the fact that the unemployment occurred during the course of a strike. Claimant was a member of the union, but did not participate in meetings or vote on union matters and was unaware of the strike until she arrived ready to work on September 13, 2022. At hearing, claimant testified, emphatically, that if the employer had allowed her to work during the strike period, she “would have absolutely gone back to work.” Transcript at 33. Although claimant picketed for a time, she did so in order to receive strike payments from the union but found the amount of the strike payments to be insufficient to meet her needs and eventually stopped picketing. Claimant answered “Yes” to the question “Did you refuse to cross the picket line?” on the Department’s labor dispute questionnaire. Transcript at 9. However, at hearing, claimant credibly explained that “I put yes, but it wasn’t that I refused to cross any line. The gates were closed. I couldn’t get in. It was locked and so I couldn’t cross the line, so that would be a yes. . . . if I had put no that would have been sounding like I went across the line, but I couldn’t because there – the gates were closed.” Transcript at 35. Claimant worked for another employer to support herself while the strike was ongoing, but this occurred shortly after October 13, 2022, which was after the weeks at issue.

Thus, the evidence demonstrating that claimant would have worked for the employer if allowed is sufficient to establish by a preponderance of evidence that claimant’s unemployment during the weeks at issue was caused by the employer’s lockout. Accordingly, because claimant was unemployed due to a lockout as defined by ORS 662.205(4) at the establishment at which she was last employed, claimant meets the elements of ORS 657.200(3)(a), which renders the disqualifying effect of ORS 657.200(1) inapplicable.

Claimant is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on ORS 657.200(1).

**DECISION:** Order No. 23-UI-237692 is affirmed.

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

**DATE of Service: December 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.