

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2024-EAB-0124**

*Reversed & Remanded*  
*Revocada y Remitida Para Otra Audiencia*

*Aviso: Si necesita interpretación verbal en español de la parte de esta decisión que está en inglés, puede obtenerla llamando a EAB al 503-378-2077, y EAB obtendrá un intérprete en la línea.*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FINDINGS OF FACT:** On August 18, 2020, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was not able, available, or actively seeking work for the weeks of May 3, 2020, through May 16, 2020 (weeks 19-20 through 20-20) and therefore was not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits for those weeks (decision # 91704). Also on August 18, 2020, the Department served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was not able, available, or actively seeking work for the week of May 31, 2020, through June 6, 2020 (week 23-20) and therefore was not eligible for benefits for that week (decision # 93821). Also on August 18, 2020, the Department served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was not able, available, or actively seeking work for the weeks of June 21, 2020, through July 25, 2020 (weeks 26-20 through 30-20) and therefore was not eligible for benefits for those weeks (decision # 100306). Also on August 18, 2020, the Department served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was not able, available, or actively seeking work for the week of August 2, 2020, through August 8, 2020 (week 32-20) and therefore was not eligible for benefits for that week (decision # 101530). On September 8, 2020, decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, and 101530 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing.

On August 16, 2021, the Department served a Notice of Determination for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) concluding that claimant was not entitled to PUA benefits effective March 24, 2020. On September 7, 2021, the August 16, 2021, PUA determination became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On September 28, 2021, claimant filed late requests for hearing on decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530, and the August 16, 2021, PUA determination.

ALJ Kangas from the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) considered claimant's requests as to decisions # 91704, 93821, and the August 16, 2021, PUA determination, and on December 22, 2021 issued Orders No. 21-UI-182439, 21-UI-182438, and 21-UI-182437, dismissing these requests for hearing as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the requests by responding to an appellant

questionnaire by January 5, 2022. ALJ Kangas also considered claimant's requests as to decisions # 100306 and 101530, and on December 23, 2021, issued Orders No. 21-UI-182572 and 21-UI-182573, dismissing these requests for hearing as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the requests by responding to an appellant questionnaire by January 6, 2022.

On January 3, 2022, claimant filed a timely response to the appellant questionnaire. On April 14, 2022, the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) mailed letters stating that Orders No. 21-UI-182439, 21-UI-182438, 21-UI-182572, 21-UI-182573, and 21-UI-182437 were vacated and that hearings would be scheduled to determine whether claimant had good cause to file the late requests for hearing and, if so, the merits of decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530, and the August 16, 2021 PUA determination.

On April 11, 2023, OAH served notices of a consolidated hearing on decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, and 101530 scheduled for April 25, 2023, at 1:30 p.m. Also on April 11, 2023, OAH served notice of a hearing on the August 16, 2021, PUA determination scheduled for April 25, 2023 at 3:30 p.m. On April 25, 2023, claimant failed to appear for the hearings, and ALJ Frank issued Orders No. 23-UI-223140, 23-UI-223141, 23-UI-223137, and 23-UI-223139 dismissing the hearing requests on decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, and 101530 due to claimant's failure to appear, and leaving those administrative decisions undisturbed. On April 26, 2023, ALJ Frank issued Order No. 23-UI-223216, dismissing the hearing request on the August 16, 2021, PUA determination due to claimant's failure to appear, and leaving the PUA determination undisturbed.

On May 1, 2023, claimant filed timely requests to reopen the April 25, 2023, hearings. ALJ Kangas considered claimant's requests to reopen, and on September 20, 2023, issued Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266, denying claimant's requests to reopen and leaving Orders No. 23-UI-223140, 23-UI-223141, 23-UI-223137, 23-UI-223139, and 23-UI-223216 undisturbed. On October 4, 2023, claimant filed applications for review of Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

Pursuant to OAR 471-041-0095 (October 29, 2006), EAB consolidated its review of Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266. For case-tracking purposes, this decision is being issued in quintuplicate (EAB Decisions 2024-EAB-0151, 2024-EAB-0125, 2024-EAB-0127, 2024-EAB-0123, and 2024-EAB-0124).

***ANTECEDENTES PROCESALES Y HECHOS:*** *El 18 de agosto de 2020, el Departamento de Empleo de Oregón (el Departamento) envió una decisión administrativa que concluía que el reclamante no pudo trabajar, no estuvo disponible para trabajar, o no estaba buscando trabajo desde el 3 de mayo de 2020 al 16 de mayo de 2020 (semanas 19-20 a 20-20) y, por lo tanto, no era elegible para los beneficios del seguro de desempleo para esas semanas (decisión # 91704). También el 18 de agosto de 2020, el Departamento envió una decisión administrativa que concluía que el reclamante no pudo trabajar, no estuvo disponible para trabajar, o no estaba buscando trabajo desde el 31 de mayo de 2020 al 6 de junio de 2020 (semana 23-20) y, por lo tanto, no era elegible para los beneficios para esa semana (decisión # 93821). También el 18 de agosto de 2020, el Departamento envió una decisión administrativa que concluía que el reclamante no pudo trabajar, no estuvo disponible para trabajar, o no estaba buscando trabajo desde el 21 de junio de 2020 al 25 de julio de 2020 (semanas 26-20 a 30-20) y, por lo tanto, no era elegible para los beneficios para esas semanas (decisión # 100306). También*

*el 18 de agosto de 2020, el Departamento envió una decisión administrativa que concluía que el reclamante no pudo trabajar, no estuvo disponible para trabajar, o no estaba buscando trabajo desde el 2 de agosto de 2020 al 8 de agosto de 2020 (semana 32-20) y, por lo tanto, no era elegible para los beneficios para esa semana (decisión # 101530). El 8 de septiembre de 2020, las decisiones # 91704, 93821, 100306 y 101530 se convirtieron en definitivas sin que el reclamante hubiera presentado una solicitud de audiencia.*

*El 16 de agosto de 2021, el Departamento envió un Aviso de Determinación de Asistencia de Desempleo por la Pandemia (PUA, por sus siglas en inglés) en el que se concluía que el reclamante no tenía derecho a los beneficios de PUA a partir del 24 de marzo de 2020. El 7 de septiembre de 2021, la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021 se convirtió en definitiva sin que el reclamante hubiera presentado una solicitud de audiencia. El 28 de septiembre de 2021, el reclamante presentó solicitudes tardías de audiencia sobre las decisiones # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530 y la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021.*

*Jueza Administrativa Kangas de la Oficina de Audiencias Administrativas (OAH, por sus siglas en inglés) consideró las solicitudes del reclamante sobre las decisiones # 91704, 93821 y la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021, y el 22 de diciembre de 2021 emitió las Órdenes No. 21-UI-182439, 21-UI-182438 y 21-UI-182437, desestimando esas solicitudes de audiencia del reclamante como tardías, sujeto al derecho del reclamante a renovar las solicitudes respondiendo a un cuestionario antes del 5 de enero del 2022. Jueza Kangas también consideró las solicitudes del reclamante sobre las decisiones # 100306 y 101530, y el 23 de diciembre de 2021 emitió las Órdenes No. 21-UI-182572 y 21-UI-182573, desestimando esas solicitudes de audiencia del reclamante como tardías, sujeto al derecho del reclamante a renovar las solicitudes respondiendo a un cuestionario antes del 6 de enero de 2022.*

*El 3 de enero de 2022, el reclamante presentó una respuesta oportuna al cuestionario. El 14 de abril de 2022, la OAH envió cartas diciendo que las Órdenes No. 21-UI-182439, 21-UI-182438, 21-UI-182572, 21-UI-182573 y 21-UI-182437 fueron anuladas y que se programarían audiencias para determinar si el reclamante tenía una buena causa para presentar las solicitudes tardías de audiencia sobre todas las decisiones y, de ser así, considere los méritos de las decisiones # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530 y la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021.*

*El 11 de abril de 2023, la OAH envió por correo al reclamante un aviso de una audiencia sobre las decisiones # 91704, 93821, 100306 y 101530 programada para el 25 de abril de 2023 a la 1:30 p.m. También el 11 de abril de 2023, la OAH envió por correo al reclamante un aviso de una audiencia sobre la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021 programada para el 25 de abril de 2023 a las 3:30 p.m. El 25 de abril de 2023, el reclamante no se presentó en ninguna de las dos audiencias, y el Juez Administrativo Frank de OAH emitió las Órdenes No. 23-UI-223140, 23-UI-223141, 23-UI-223137 y 23-UI-223139 desestimando las solicitudes de audiencia sobre las decisiones # 91704, 93821, 100306 y 101530 porque el demandante no se presentó a la audiencia, y dejando esas decisiones administrativas sin cambios. El 26 de abril de 2023, Juez Frank emitió la Orden No. 23-UI-223216, desestimando la solicitud de audiencia sobre la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021 porque el demandante no se presentó a la audiencia y dejando la determinación de PUA sin cambios. El 1 de mayo de 2023, el reclamante presentó solicitudes oportunas para reabrir las audiencias del 25 de abril de 2023. Jueza Kangas consideró esas solicitudes del reclamante y, el 20 de septiembre de 2023, emitió las Órdenes No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265 y 23-UI-*

236266, denegando las solicitudes de reapertura del reclamante y dejando sin cambios las Órdenes No. 23-UI-223140, 23-UI-223141, 23-UI-223137, 23-UI-223139 y 23-UI-223216.

*De conformidad con la regla OAR 471-041-0095 (29 de octubre de 2006), EAB consolidó su revisión de las Órdenes No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265 y 23-UI-236266. Esta decisión se emite cinco veces como Decisiones EAB 2024-EAB-0151, 2024-EAB-0125, 2024-EAB-0127, 2024-EAB-0123 y 2024-EAB-0124.*

**EVIDENTIARY MATTER:** EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). The additional evidence is the handwritten statement (along with a typed English translation provided by EAB) which claimant provided with their October 4, 2023, applications for review of Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266, 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.

**ASUNTO DE EVIDENCIA:** *EAB ha considerado evidencia adicional al tomar esta decisión bajo la regla OAR 471-041-0090(1) (13 de mayo de 2019). La evidencia adicional es la declaración manuscrita (junto con una traducción al inglés proporcionada por EAB) que el reclamante proporcionó con sus solicitudes de revisión del 4 de octubre de 2023 de las Órdenes No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265 y 23-UI-236266, y ha sido marcada como Exhibit (Anexo) 1 de EAB, y una copia proporcionada a las partes con esta decisión. Cualquier parte que se oponga a que consideramos el Exhibit (Anexo) 1 de EAB debe presentar dicha objeción a esta oficina por escrito, exponiendo la base de la objeción por escrito, dentro de los diez días posteriores a que enviemos por correo esta decisión. OAR 471-041-0090(2). A menos que se reciba y sostenga dicha objeción, la prueba permanecerá en el expediente.*

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266 are reversed and these matters are remanded for hearings to develop the record regarding whether there is good cause to allow claimant's requests to reopen the April 25, 2023, hearings. If so, the hearings should address whether claimant had good cause to file their late requests for hearing on decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530, and the August 16, 2021, PUA determination and, if so, the merits of those administrative decisions.

**CONCLUSIONES Y RAZONES:** *Se revocan las Órdenes No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265 y 23-UI-236266 y se remiten estos asuntos para audiencias para determinar si existe una buena causa para permitir las solicitudes del reclamante para reabrir las audiencias del 25 de abril de 2023. Si hubiera una buena causa para reabrir las audiencias del 25 de abril de 2023, las audiencias deben abordar también si el reclamante tenía una buena causa para presentar sus solicitudes tardías de audiencia sobre las decisiones # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530 y la Determinación de PUA del 16 de agosto de 2021 y, de ser así, los méritos de esas decisiones administrativas.*

ORS 657.270(5) provides that any party who failed to appear at a hearing may request to reopen the hearing, and the request will be allowed if it was filed within 20 days of the date the hearing decision was issued and shows good cause for failing to appear. “Good cause” exists when the requesting party’s failure to appear at the hearing arose from an excusable mistake or from factors beyond the party’s reasonable control. OAR 471-040-0040(2) (February 10, 2012).

Under OAR 471-040-0040(6) and OAR 471-041-0060(4), an application for review filed by a party that failed to appear at a hearing and whose request for hearing was then dismissed for failure to appear is treated as a request to reopen. These rules applied to claimant because claimant failed to appear at the April 25, 2023, hearings and claimant’s failure to appear was the basis upon which ALJ Frank dismissed the cases via Orders No. 23-UI-223140, 23-UI-223141, 23-UI-223137, 23-UI-223139, and 23-UI-223216. Claimant then filed timely applications for review of the dismissal orders, and upon doing so OAR 471-040-0040(6) and OAR 471-041-0060(4) had the effect of requiring claimant’s applications for review to be treated as requests to reopen. However, claimant filed the applications for review by simply mailing in a preprinted form upon which they checked boxes, wrote their home address, and signed their name. *See* Exhibit 5 at 5.<sup>1</sup> No additional information was provided. Therefore, the requests to reopen did not offer any information to enable EAB to conduct an analysis of whether the requests should be allowed because claimant had good cause for failing to appear.

The orders under review<sup>2</sup> denied claimant’s requests to reopen. The orders acknowledged that claimant had requested “a Spanish speaking interpreter to assist him at the hearing” and therefore presumably possessed limited English proficiency. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 23-UI-236263 at 2. However, the orders under review noted that ALJ Frank’s dismissal orders each contained a notice, in English and Spanish, that stated that claimant may request to reopen and that the request needed to show good cause for claimant’s failure to appear. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 23-UI-236263 at 2-3. The orders then concluded that it was within claimant’s control to follow the instructions in the notice and provide information regarding whether they had good cause to fail to appear. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 23-UI-236263 at 3. The orders concluded that claimant did not provide any such information and so failed to show good cause for missing the April 25, 2023, hearings. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 23-UI-236263 at 3. The orders under review are reversed and remanded for further development of the record because claimant was not given a meaningful opportunity to provide information as to whether they had good cause for their failure to appear at the April 25, 2023, hearings.

First, it is plain that claimant is a Spanish speaker with limited English proficiency. In the written statement claimant provided with their application for review, claimant wrote, translated from Spanish, “I do not know English.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2.

Second, the notices contained in ALJ Frank’s dismissal orders, which are written in Spanish and English, did not give notice that an application for review would be treated as a request to reopen in claimant’s circumstance and thus had a substantial potential to confuse claimant, and potentially cause claimant to fail to provide the information needed to support a request to reopen, which inevitably led to denial of the requests. The dismissal orders indicate that claimant can *either* file an application for

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit 5 appears in the record with the same pagination in each of the individual cases consolidated herein.

<sup>2</sup> The orders under review, Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266, were in all relevant respects identical, featuring the use of the same language on the same relevant pages.

review *or* a request to reopen, but do not specify that if claimant files an application for review, it will be treated as a request to reopen, such that if claimant files an application for review, they should include with it the information required to be included with a request to reopen.

Specifically, each dismissal order, in English and Spanish, stated in their respective certificates of mailing that any appeal of the order must be filed within 20 days of the date of the order to be timely. *See* Exhibit 4 at 1. They also stated on the certificate of mailing page, in English and Spanish, that “If you failed to appear for the hearing, you may request that your case be reopened. For directions regarding reopening, please refer to the enclosed information.” *See* Exhibit 4 at 1. Then, under a heading at the end of each dismissal order, in English and Spanish, each order 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.” *See* Exhibit 4 at 3. Finally, each dismissal order stated, in English and Spanish, as follows:

If you did not appear at the hearing, you may request to reopen the hearing. These requests are governed by OAR 471-040-0040 and 471-040-0041 and should be filed with the Office of Administrative Hearings. Your request to reopen the hearing must: 1) be in writing; 2) show good cause for failing to appear at the hearing; “Good cause” exists when an action, delay, or failure to act arises from an excusable mistake or from factors beyond an applicant’s reasonable control; and 3) either be filed within 20 days of when the order from the hearing you missed was mailed, or else show good cause to extend the period to request reopening of your case, and show that you filed your reopen request within seven days of when those factors or circumstances ceased to exist. Include all information regarding your reopen request that you want the Administrative Law Judge to consider when deciding whether to grant your reopen request. Requesting to reopen a hearing with the Office of Administrative Hearings is not the same as seeking review of the order by the Employment Appeals Board.

*See* Exhibit 4 at 3-4.

Nowhere do the dismissal orders specify that if a party in claimant’s procedural situation files an application for review, it will be treated as a request to reopen. Nor is there any indication that claimant was on notice that, as a result of the treatment of the applications for review as requests to reopen, claimant needed to include the information with their applications for review that is required to be included in requests to reopen. Without the knowledge that the applications for review would be treated as requests to reopen, claimant failed to provide the required information. This resulted in denials of the requests to reopen that were virtually automatic.

Finally, the issues of questionable notice and risk of confusion discussed above were compounded by the fact that key substantive portions of the dismissal orders, the portions needed to understand the context of the dismissals, were not translated into Spanish. The portions of the dismissal orders contained under the “ORDER” heading were written in both English and Spanish. These stated merely that “The request for hearing filed by the claimant is dismissed under ORS 657.270 and OAR 471-040-0035. The administrative decision . . . remains undisturbed.” Exhibit 4 at 2. However, the portions of the dismissal orders contained under the “FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW” heading were not written in Spanish. Those portions read as follows:

The claimant failed to appear for the hearing scheduled for April 25, 2023. The administrative law judge checked the telephone line attendance system 10 minutes after the scheduled hearing and confirmed that the claimant was not present. ORS 657.260 and OAR 471-040-0035 permit dismissal of a party's hearing if that party failed to appear for a hearing. The claimant's request for hearing is dismissed because the claimant failed to appear for the hearing.

Exhibit 4 at 2. As mentioned above, claimant "d[id] not know English." EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. As a result, the failure of the dismissal order to convey in Spanish the *reason* claimant's requests for hearing were being dismissed created a substantial risk of confusion, and may have given rise to a reasonable misunderstanding on claimant's part about which appeal procedure to pursue—a request to reopen or an application for review. That claimant was confused or operating under a misunderstanding due in part of the language barrier they faced, is evident on the preprinted form claimant used to file their applications for review of the dismissal orders (which, as discussed above, by operation of OAR 471-040-0040(6) and OAR 471-041-0060(4) were treated as requests to reopen). On that form, which was printed exclusively in English, claimant checked every available box, including one meant to indicate that the applying party is the employer in the case. *See* Exhibit 5 at 5. Claimant also checked a box to indicate that claimant would prefer to have EAB communicate with them by email, but then wrote their home address in the blank provided for writing in one's email address. *See* Exhibit 5 at 5.

For the foregoing reasons, Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266 are reversed and these matters are remanded for a hearing to develop the record regarding whether there is good cause to allow claimant's requests to reopen the April 25, 2023, hearing. On remand, the ALJ should ask questions to develop the record necessary to determine if claimant's requests to reopen should be allowed. If the record on remand shows that claimant's requests to reopen should be allowed, the ALJ should determine whether claimant had good cause to file their late requests for hearing on decisions # 91704, 93821, 100306, 101530, and the August 16, 2021, PUA determination and, if so, the merits of those administrative decisions.

**DECISION:** Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266 are set aside, and these matters remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order. *La Orden de la Audiencia No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, y 23-UI-236266 se pone a un lado, y esta materia se remite para otros procedimientos constantes con esta orden.*

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

**DATE of Service: February 16, 2024**

***FECHA: 16 de febrero del 2024***

**NOTE:** The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Orders No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, and 23-UI-236266 or return these matters to EAB. Only a timely application for review of the subsequent order will cause this matter to return to EAB.

**NOTA:** *La falta de cualquier parte de presentarse a la audiencia sobre la remisión no reinstalará la Orden de la Audiencia No. 23-UI-236263, 23-UI-236264, 23-UI-236260, 23-UI-236265, y 23-UI-236266, ni devolverá esta orden a la EAB. Solamente una aplicación oportuna para revisión de la orden subsiguiente de la nueva audiencia volverá este caso a la 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.

**Por favor, ayúdenos mejorar nuestros servicios completando un formulario de encuesta sobre nuestro servicio de atención al cliente.** *Para llenar este formulario, puede visitar <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. Puede acceder a la encuesta usando una computadora, tableta, o teléfono inteligente. Si no puede llenar el formulario sobre el internet, puede comunicarse con nuestra oficina para una copia impresa de la encuesta.*





# 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 الاستئناف 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.