

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2023-EAB-1252-R

Request for Reconsideration Allowed
2023-EAB-1252 Reversed on Reconsideration ~ Late Application for Review Allowed
Order No. 22-UI-192923 ~ Reversed & Remanded

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On October 13, 2020, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant quit working for the employer without good cause and was disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 15, 2020 (decision # 112338). On November 2, 2020, decision # 112338 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On December 16, 2020, claimant filed a late request for hearing. ALJ Kangas considered 's claimant's request, and on December 28, 2020, issued Order No. 20-UI-158269, dismissing the request as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the request by responding to an appellant questionnaire by January 11, 2021. On January 11, 2021, claimant filed a timely response to the appellant questionnaire. On February 2, 2021, the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) mailed a letter stating that Order No. 20-UI-158269 was vacated and that a hearing would be scheduled to determine whether to allow claimant's late request for hearing and, if so, the merits of decision # 112338.

On May 4, 2022, ALJ Messecar convened a hearing, and following an exchange initiated by the ALJ, based on the ALJ's view that there was "some indication in the request for hearing that [claimant was] not actually desiring to appeal the administrative decision 112338," claimant replied "yes" to the question posed by the ALJ, "Are you withdrawing your request for hearing so this decision will stand?" Audio Record at 4:35 to 7:32. ALJ Messecar then instructed claimant to exit the hearing, advising that the ALJ "will send [claimant] a decision that says you don't wish to have this decision appealed." Audio Record at 7:32. Claimant then exited the hearing, and the ALJ concluded the hearing a few moments later. Audio Record at 7:38 to 8:22.

On May 4, 2022, ALJ Messecar issued Order No. 22-UI-192923, concluding that claimant withdrew his request for hearing and dismissing the hearing request on that basis, leaving decision # 112338 undisturbed. On May 24, 2022, Order No. 22-UI-192923 became final without claimant having filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB). On November 13, 2023, claimant filed a late application for review of Order No. 22-UI-192923 with EAB. On December 26, 2023, EAB issued EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1252, dismissing claimant's application for review without prejudice.

On January 8, 2024, claimant filed a timely request for reconsideration of EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1252. This decision is issued pursuant to EAB's authority under ORS 657.290(3).

EVIDENTIARY MATTER: EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). The additional evidence is claimant's request for reconsideration, and has been marked as EAB Exhibit 2, and a copy provided to the parties with this decision. Any party that objects to our admitting EAB Exhibit 2 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.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On October 13, 2020, the Department issued decision # 112338 concluding that claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause and was disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 15, 2020. On December 16, 2020, claimant filed a late request for hearing on decision # 112338. OAH dismissed the hearing request as late without good cause, subject to claimant providing additional information by submitting answers to an appellant questionnaire. Claimant provided answers to the appellant questionnaire in a timely manner. Thereafter, OAH sent claimant a letter advising that a hearing would be scheduled to determine whether to allow claimant's late request for hearing and, if so, the merits of decision # 112338.

(2) Nearly a year and a half later, on May 4, 2022, ALJ Messecar convened a hearing on decision # 112338. Claimant appeared, and the ALJ began to explain procedural aspects of the hearing. Audio Record at 1:40. The ALJ described Exhibit 2, which included claimant's online hearing request referral form. Audio Record at 3:58. In the issue description section of the hearing request referral form, claimant wrote as follows:

My job lied about me quitting my job and now my claim is denied. They told me I could get PUA and it has been 2 moths [*sic*] since then. They did not tell me what to do. Please help me.

Exhibit 2 at 2.

(3) The ALJ believed the statement from the hearing request referral form was an indication that claimant did not desire to appeal decision # 112338. The ALJ stopped explaining hearing preliminaries and, on the ALJ's own initiative, the following exchange occurred:

ALJ Messecar: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. [claimant]?

Claimant: Yes.

ALJ Messecar: There is some indication in the request for hearing that you're not actually desiring to appeal the administrative decision 112338. So I just wanted to clarify, if I get past the late appeal issue, the sole issue that I will address at today's hearing is whether or not you were employed by Cessco and had a work separation on or about March 19th of 2020. I won't address any other issue besides a late appeal and that work separation from Cessco in March of 2020.

Claimant: Okay.

ALJ Messecar: So with that information do you still wish to appeal this decision?

Claimant: Um, I have no idea why my appeal is going through this late. Everything's pretty much past its usable date. So I have no idea why this is—

ALJ Messecar: My question is, do you want to appeal it? It, it certainly is not a timely, [chuckles] uh, appeal. Y'know what I mean. It's, this decision was issued back in October of 2020 and we're just getting to the appeal of that now. The office of Administrative Hearings. But regardless of the timeliness of that, you have the r—, so, we can do two things, you can say “yes, I want to continue my appeal of Cessco, of the Cessco decision” and we'll go forward today with this hearing. If you say “no, I don't want to appeal it” because, uh, you, you make some statement in the hearing request that says that you were, uh, oh sorry, this is wh—, says “you lied about your job” and “they told you you'd get PUA” so I couldn't tell from that if you still wish to appeal this administrative decision or not. I don't, I just need to know, yes or no, whether you want to continue this appeal and hold this hearing today.

Claimant: No, I do not.

ALJ Messecar: Okay, so you want to withdraw your request for hearing regarding the decision that you were employed by Cessco and voluntary quit, is that right?

Claimant: [short pause] Yes.

ALJ Messecar: Let me explain what that means. So if you say, yes, I want to withdraw my request for hearing, that just meant that I'm gonna issue an order that says, you know, had a hearing, met Mr. [claimant] at the hearing, and he said that he was withdrawing his request so the decision that states that you quit work without good cause would stand.

Does that make sense?

Claimant: Yes.

ALJ Messecar: Okay, and so are you withdrawing your request for hearing so that this decision will stand?

Claimant: [long pause] Yes.

ALJ Messecar: Okay, well if you're withdrawing your request for hearing, then you can go ahead and hang up and I will send you a decision that says that you don't wish to have this decision, uh, appealed, okay?

Claimant: Okay, thank you.

ALJ Messecar: Thanks so much for calling in.
[claimant hangs up.]

Audio Record at 4:36 to 7:49.

(4) Claimant is a disabled veteran, has a hearing impairment, and suffers from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). During the May 4, 2022 hearing, claimant “was unaware of what the telephone hearing was in reference to[.]” EAB Exhibit 2 at 1. Claimant further understood the outcome of the hearing to be as follows:

I only understood the judge asking me if I wanted to end the phone court case. I in no way wanted to the end the unemployment appeal. I was not told that it was an appeal for unemployment. It had been years since I initially filed the appeal, so I had no way of knowing what was happening.

EAB Exhibit 2 at 1.

(5) On May 4, 2022, OAH mailed Order No. 22-UI-192923 to claimant's address on file with OAH.

(6) Order No. 22-UI-192923 described the issue as "Should the request for hearing be dismissed?" Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1. The order found that "[a]t the start of the hearing, claimant withdrew his request for hearing" and concluded that "claimant's request to withdraw is allowed and the request for hearing is dismissed." Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1. Then, under its "Order" section, Order No. 22-UI-192923 stated that the "request for hearing filed by the claimant is dismissed" and that decision # 112338 remains undisturbed. Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1.

(7) Along with its references to dismissal, Order No. 22-UI-192923 also stated, "You may appeal this decision by filing the attached form Application for Review with the Employment Appeals Board within 20 days of the date that this decision is mailed." Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1. Order No. 22-UI-192923 also stated on its certificate of mailing that "Any appeal from this Order must be filed on or before May 24, 2022 to be timely."

(8) Claimant received Order No. 22-UI-192923 shortly after it was mailed. Claimant "was unable to make the May 24, 2022 deadline" to file an application for review with EAB because claimant "thought after reading [Order No. 22-UI-192923] there was no way to appeal." EAB Exhibit 2 at 1. Claimant understood Order No. 22-UI-192923 to be "stat[ing] that no appeal was available . . . due to the ALJ's dismissal." EAB Exhibit 2 at 1.

(9) Claimant eventually began receiving bills in the mail alleging that he owed overpayments to the Department based on benefits he previously received. Claimant contacted the office of U.S. Senator Jeff Merkley, and a constituent service worker contacted the Department to inquire about claimant's situation. On November 8, 2023, the constituent service worker informed claimant that the Department advised that claimant had the "right to file an Application for Review with EAB" regarding Order No. 22-UI-192923. EAB Exhibit 2 at 1.

(10) On November 13, 2023, claimant filed a late application for review of Order No. 22-UI-192923 with EAB.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant's request for reconsideration is allowed. Claimant's late application for review is allowed. Order No. 22-UI-192923 is reversed. Claimant did not knowingly and voluntarily withdraw his request for hearing. The matter is remanded for a hearing on whether claimant's late request for hearing should be allowed and, if so, the merits of decision # 112338.

Request for Reconsideration. ORS 657.290(3) authorizes the Employment Appeals Board to reconsider any previous decision of the Employment Appeals Board, including "the making of a new decision to the extent necessary and appropriate for the correction of previous error of fact or law." The request is subject to dismissal unless it includes a statement that a copy was provided to the other parties, and is filed on or before the 20th day after the decision sought to be reconsidered was mailed. OAR 471-041-0145(2) (May 13, 2019).

EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1252, issued December 26, 2023, dismissed claimant's application for review without prejudice to claimant filing a request to reconsider under OAR 471-041-0145. On January 8,

2024, claimant filed a request for reconsideration consistent with the requirements set forth in OAR 471-041-0145. The request for reconsideration is therefore allowed.

Late Application for Review. An application for review is timely if it is filed within 20 days of the date that OAH mailed the order for which review is sought. ORS 657.270(6); OAR 471-041-0070(1) (May 13, 2019). The 20-day filing period may be extended a “reasonable time” upon a showing of “good cause.” ORS 657.875; OAR 471-041-0070(2). “Good cause” means that factors or circumstances beyond the applicant’s reasonable control prevented timely filing. OAR 471-041-0070(2)(a). A “reasonable time” is seven days after the circumstances that prevented the timely filing ceased to exist. OAR 471-041-0070(2)(b). A late application for review will be dismissed unless it includes a written statement describing the circumstances that prevented a timely filing. OAR 471-041-0070(3).

The application for review of Order No. 22-UI-192923 was due by May 24, 2022. Because claimant filed his application for review on November 13, 2023, the application for review was late.

Claimant is a hearing-impaired disabled veteran, who suffers from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). When claimant received Order No. 22-UI-192923, he believed after reading it that “there was no way to appeal.” EAB Exhibit 2 at 1. Claimant’s belief that he could not appeal, though mistaken, was reasonable under the circumstances. The hearing order repeatedly used the word “dismissed,” in that it described the issue as “Should the request for hearing be dismissed?”; concluded that “claimant’s request to withdraw is allowed and the request for hearing is dismissed”; and under its “Order” section, stated that the “request for hearing filed by the claimant is dismissed” and that decision # 112338 remains undisturbed. Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1. Because the word “dismissed” has a tone of finality that suggests additional appeals are not available, the hearing order’s frequent references to dismissal could confuse a reasonable person in claimant’s situation and lead to claimant’s mistaken belief.

Order No. 22-UI-192923 also stated, “You may appeal this decision by filing the attached form Application for Review with the Employment Appeals Board within 20 days of the date that this decision is mailed.” Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1. The order also stated on its certificate of mailing that “Any appeal from this Order must be filed on or before May 24, 2022 to be timely.” However, this language did not adequately notify claimant of his right to appeal to EAB in light of the ALJ’s statements at the May 4, 2022 hearing. Claimant understood Order No. 22-UI-192923 to be “stat[ing] that no appeal was available . . . due to the ALJ’s dismissal.” EAB Exhibit 2 at 1. During the hearing, the ALJ initiated a discussion about whether claimant wanted to withdraw his appeal and pressed claimant on the matter when he expressed confusion. The ALJ then failed to inform claimant that, if he consented to withdrawing his request for hearing, he could appeal the dismissal order to EAB. Rather, the ALJ specified, “I’m gonna issue an order that says, you know, had a hearing, met Mr. [claimant] at the hearing, and he said that he was withdrawing his request so the decision that states that you quit work without good cause would stand.” Audio Record at 6:57 to 7:20.

Given that the ALJ advised claimant that withdrawal would result in dismissal and that the voluntary quit decision would stand but failed to mention that the ALJ’s dismissal order could be appealed by claimant to EAB, coupled with the fact that the language used in the hearing order had a tone of finality that suggested additional appeals would not available, claimant’s mistaken belief that there was no way to appeal Order No. 22-UI-192923 was reasonable. This mistaken belief constituted a factor beyond

claimant's reasonable control that prevented a timely filing of an application for review of Order No. 22-UI-192923.

Claimant's reasonable mistaken belief that he could not appeal Order No. 22-UI-192923 persisted until November 8, 2023, when the constituent service worker informed claimant that the Department had advised that claimant had the "right to file an Application for Review with EAB" regarding Order No. 22-UI-192923. EAB Exhibit 2 at 1. Claimant filed his application for review of Order No. 22-UI-192923 on November 13, 2023, less than seven days later. Claimant therefore filed his application for review within a seven-day reasonable time after the circumstances that prevented a timely filing ceased to exist. Thus, claimant established good cause to extend the filing deadline to November 13, 2023, and the late application for review is allowed.

Dismissal of Hearing. ORS 657.270(7)(a)(A) provides, in pertinent part, that "[t]he administrative law judge may dismiss a request for hearing" if "[t]he request for hearing is withdrawn by the requesting party."

Order No. 22-UI-192923 concluded that claimant "withdrew the request for hearing" and dismissed claimant's request for hearing on that basis. Order No. 22-UI-192923 at 1. The record does not support the conclusion that claimant withdrew his hearing request because claimant's withdrawal request was not knowing and voluntary.

Although ORS 657.270(7)(a)(A) authorizes an ALJ to dismiss a hearing request where the requesting party requests to withdraw, principles of due process require that a party's withdrawal request be knowing and voluntary. This means that the withdrawal must not be the result of a confused process initiated by the ALJ that fails to ensure that the withdrawing party understands the consequences of their hearing request withdrawal. Claimant's withdrawal request was not knowing and voluntary.

First, it is not evident why the ALJ believed that claimant's statement from the hearing request referral form was an indication that claimant did not desire to appeal decision # 112338. The statement, "My job lied about me quitting my job and now my claim is denied" can reasonably be understood as expressing disagreement with the conclusions of decision # 112338 that claimant quit work without good cause and should be disqualified from receiving benefits. This explained, at least to some degree, claimant's decision to file his request for hearing. Although the statement contained a vague reference to the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) program, many eligibility factors for PUA and regular unemployment insurance are interrelated, so a passing mention of PUA is not unusual, particularly where, as here, claimant's work separation occurred at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020. Further, after submitting the hearing request statement but before the hearing, claimant timely provided answers to an appellant questionnaire issued by OAH, a necessary condition to receiving a hearing, and a strong indicator that claimant was committed to pursuing his appeal of decision # 112338.

Next, even if the ALJ was warranted in briefly mentioning the statement at hearing, once the ALJ discussed the scope of the hearing with claimant it was improper to continue to press him as to whether he wanted to go forward with the appeal of decision # 112338. Specifically, in the beginning of the exchange, the ALJ stated, "So I just wanted to clarify, if I get past the late appeal issue, the sole issue that I will address at today's hearing is whether or not you were employed by Cessco and had a work separation on or about March 19th of 2020. I won't address any other issue besides a late appeal and that

work separation from Cessco in March of 2020.” Audio Record at 4:49. Claimant then responded, “Okay.” Audio Record at 5:15. This was an incomplete explanation of the scope of the hearing. As part of assessing the work separation issue, the ALJ would adjudicate whether claimant had voluntarily left work and whether he did so for good cause (or, conversely, whether claimant was discharged, and if so, if it was for misconduct connected with work). Claimant’s hearing request referral statement that “[m]y job lied about me quitting my job and now my claim is denied,” suggests that claimant intended to dispute any assertion that he had quit his job. That the ALJ failed to explain adjudicating the work separation would likely entail addressing whether claimant had voluntarily quit, may have misled claimant into believing that the voluntary quit issue was beyond the scope of the appeal. In any event, once claimant answered that he understood the issues to be decided at the hearing, without then expressing any indication that he did not wish to proceed with the hearing, the ALJ asked claimant answer her next question, “So with that information do you still wish to appeal this decision?” Audio Record at 5:19.

Claimant’s answer to that question showed he was confused. Claimant responded, “Um, I have no idea why my appeal is going through this late. Everything’s pretty much past its usable date. So I have no idea why this is—” Audio Record at 5:22. Claimant’s reference to the passage of time was not surprising because nearly a year and half had passed since he filed his hearing request. However, rather than address claimant’s confusion regarding the delay in having his appeal heard, the ALJ interrupted claimant and stated, “My question is, do you want to appeal it?” Audio Record at 5:36. Claimant’s perspective of this juncture of the hearing was that he “asked the judge for clarification of what the case was for” and was “snapped at” by the ALJ “for not answering the question.” EAB Exhibit 2 at 1. The ALJ’s insistence that claimant answer her question about withdrawal, rather than address claimant’s confusion about the delay in his appeal being heard, raises doubts about the voluntariness of the hearing request withdrawal claimant gave a few moments later.

From there, the ALJ continued to insist on an answer, asking “yes or no, whether you want to continue this appeal and hold this hearing today.” Audio Record at 6:32. Claimant responded, “No, I do not.” Audio Record at 6:38. The ALJ then asked the leading question, “Okay, so you want to withdraw your request for hearing regarding the decision that you were employed by Cessco and voluntary quit, is that right?” Audio Record at 6:45. After a short pause, claimant answered affirmatively. The ALJ then offered to “explain what that means” by describing that she would issue a dismissal order and that “the decision that states that you quit work without good cause would stand.” Audio Record at 6:57. However, the ALJ failed to explain that her dismissal order would be appealable to EAB, an omission that, as discussed above, ultimately contributed to claimant’s failure to file a timely application for review. This failure to explain all of the consequences of claimant’s hearing request withdrawal suggests that claimant’s withdrawal request was not knowingly given.

Finally, after the foregoing exchange, the ALJ asked “Okay, and so are you withdrawing your request for hearing so that this decision will stand?” Audio Record at 7:22. After a long pause, claimant answered affirmatively, and hung up. Claimant, who is a hearing-impaired disabled veteran and suffers from PTSD, understood the outcome of the hearing to be as follows:

I only understood the judge asking me if I wanted to end the phone court case. I in no way wanted to the end the unemployment appeal. I was not told that it was an appeal for

unemployment. It had been years since I initially filed the appeal, so I had no way of knowing what was happening.

EAB Exhibit 2 at 1.

Viewing these points in combination—that it was unnecessary for the ALJ to initiate the discussion whether claimant wanted to withdraw when claimant had given no initial indication he wanted to withdraw, to persist in having claimant state whether he wanted to withdraw when he expressed confusion regarding the delay in having his appeal heard, and the failure to explain all the consequences of withdrawing, coupled with claimant’s inaccurate understanding of the outcome of the hearing—the record shows that claimant’s hearing request was not “withdrawn” consistent with due process principles because it was not knowing and voluntary. As a result, the dismissal of claimant’s hearing request must be reversed.

ORS 657.270 requires the ALJ to give all parties a reasonable opportunity for a fair hearing. That obligation necessarily requires the ALJ to ensure that the record developed at the hearing shows a full and fair inquiry into the facts necessary for consideration of all issues properly before the ALJ in a case. ORS 657.270(3); *see accord Dennis v. Employment Division*, 302 Or 160, 728 P2d 12 (1986). Because further development of the record is necessary for a determination of whether claimant’s late request for hearing should be allowed and, if so, the merits of decision # 112338, Order No. 22-UI-192923 is reversed, and this matter is remanded.

DECISION: Order No. 22-UI-192923 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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

DATE of Service: February 12, 2024

NOTE: The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Order No. 22-UI-192923 or return this matter to EAB. Only a timely application for review of the subsequent order will cause this matter to return to EAB.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. You can access the survey using a computer, tablet, or smartphone. If you are unable to complete the survey online and need a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



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.