

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2024-EAB-0279**

*Reversed & Remanded*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On August 26, 2020, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was not available for work for the weeks including June 21, 2020, through August 22, 2020 (weeks 26-20 through 34-20), and therefore was ineligible to receive benefits for those weeks and until the reason for the denial had ended (decision # 71131). On September 15, 2020, decision # 71131 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On February 19, 2021, the Department served a Notice of Determination for Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) concluding that claimant was not eligible to receive PUA benefits effective March 22, 2020.

On March 8, 2021, claimant submitted a request for hearing that the Department regarded both as a late request for hearing on decision # 71131 and a timely request for hearing on the February 19, 2021, PUA determination. ALJ Kangas considered claimant's late request for hearing on decision # 71131 and, on April 12, 2021, issued Order No. 21-UI-164606, dismissing claimant's request for hearing as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the request by responding to an appellant questionnaire by April 26, 2021. On May 3, 2021, Order No. 21-UI-164606 became final without claimant having filed a response to the appellant questionnaire or an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

On April 20, 2021, ALJ Monroe conducted a hearing on the February 19, 2021 PUA determination that was interpreted in Russian, and on April 22, 2021 issued Order No. 21-UI-165381, modifying the February 19, 2021 PUA determination by concluding that claimant was not entitled to receive PUA benefits for the weeks of March 29, 2020 through June 20, 2020 (weeks 14-20 through 25-20) but was entitled to receive PUA benefits for the weeks of June 21, 2020 through February 20, 2021 (weeks 26-20 through 07-21). On May 12, 2021, Order No. 21-UI-165381 became final without the Department or claimant having filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

On March 18, 2024, claimant faxed a submission to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) consisting, in pertinent part, a copy of decision # 71131, the hearing request referral the Department treated as a request for hearing on decision # 71131 and the February 19, 2021 PUA determination, a completed application for review form, an appellant questionnaire response, a copy of Order No. 21-UI-164606, a copy of Order No. 21-UI-165381, and a cover letter. For the reasons discussed below, EAB

considers the March 18, 2024, submission to be a late application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381. This matter comes before EAB based upon claimant's March 18, 2024, late application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381.

**EVIDENTIARY MATTER:** EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). The additional evidence is relevant portions of claimant's March 18, 2024, faxed submission, which EAB considers to be a late application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381 and the written statement included therewith. This additional evidence 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.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) Prior to August 2019, claimant worked for an employer in a traditional employment relationship as a caretaker for elderly people. In or around August 2019, claimant started a housecleaning business.

(2) Following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, claimant experienced a significant reduction in the housecleaning services she provided. The reduction in housecleaning services occurred for multiple reasons because clients were home and did not want services, children of clients were home and attending school on-line, and because clients did not want claimant in their homes because they were concerned about COVID-19 transmission.

(3) In early April 2020, claimant filed an initial claim for regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) benefits. The Department determined that claimant had a valid claim for regular UI benefits. Claimant filed weekly claims for regular UI benefits and received regular UI benefits for the weeks of March 29, 2020, through June 20, 2020 (weeks 14-20 through 25-20).

(4) On August 26, 2020, the Department issued decision # 71131 concluding that claimant was ineligible for regular UI benefits for the weeks of June 21, 2020, through August 22, 2020 (weeks 26-20 through 34-20) and until the reason for the denial had ended, because claimant's self-employment activities made her unavailable for work. On September 15, 2020, decision # 71131 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing.

(5) On July 22, 2020, claimant filed an initial application for PUA benefits. Claimant claimed PUA benefits for the weeks of March 29, 2020, through February 20, 2021 (weeks 14-20 through 07-21). The Department did not pay claimant PUA benefits for these weeks.

(6) On February 19, 2021, the Department issued the February 19, 2021, PUA determination concluding that claimant was not eligible to receive PUA benefits because she was eligible for regular UI benefits. On March 8, 2021, claimant submitted a request for hearing using the Department's online hearing request referral form. The Department regarded claimant's request both as a late request for hearing on decision # 71131 and a timely request for hearing on the February 19, 2021, PUA determination.

(7) On April 12, 2021, ALJ Kangas issued Order No. 21-UI-164606 dismissing claimant's request for hearing on decision # 71131 as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the request by responding to an

appellant questionnaire by April 26, 2021. On May 3, 2021, Order No. 21-UI-164606 became final without claimant having filed a response to the appellant questionnaire or an application for review with EAB.

(8) On April 20, 2021, ALJ Monroe conducted a hearing on the February 19, 2021, PUA determination. At hearing, the Department's witness testified, in reference to the effect of decision # 71131, that, subject to asking some questions to clarify claimant's "Covid impact date" claimant "could be eligible for PUA after her denial date for the regular UI claim, which is June 21, 2020." Transcript at 6. Near the end of the hearing, when asked whether claimant sufficiently answered questions about her Covid impact date, the Department's witness testified, "Yeah, I understand the claimant's history of – of leaving work and – and why" and "we have the information we need to qualify her for PUA." Transcript at 14-15.

(9) On April 22, 2021, ALJ Monroe issued Order No. 21-UI-165381, which concluded that claimant was not entitled to receive PUA benefits for weeks 14-20 through 25-20—the weeks she had received regular UI benefits—but was entitled to receive PUA benefits for weeks 26-20 through 07-21. On May 12, 2021, Order No. 21-UI-165381 became final without the Department or claimant having filed an application for review with EAB.

(10) The Department did not pay claimant PUA benefits for weeks 26-20 through 07-21 as required by Order No. 21-UI-165381. Review of Department claim records shows no recognition on the part of the Department of the April 20, 2021, hearing on the February 19, 2021 PUA determination or that ALJ Monroe issued Order No. 21-UI-165381 concluding that claimant was entitled to PUA benefits.<sup>1</sup>

(11) Following the issuance of Order No. 21-UI-165381 concluding that claimant was entitled to receive PUA benefits, claimant "sent multiple requests to the Employment [D]epartment requesting an update[]" but "kept on getting a response that they are working on it." EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. In February 2024, claimant called the Department and spoke with a representative who told claimant she "will not be receiving a payout" of PUA benefits "because [her] benefits were denied." EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. The representative told claimant to contact OAH for more information. EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. Claimant contacted OAH, and OAH sent claimant a copy of Order No. 21-UI-165381, among other documents. EAB Exhibit 1 at 1.

(12) On March 18, 2024, claimant faxed a submission to OAH that consisted, in pertinent part, of a copy of decision # 71131, the hearing request referral that the Department had treated as requesting a hearing on both decision # 71131 and the February 19, 2021 PUA determination, a completed application for review form, a completed appellant questionnaire response that had been attached to Order No. 21-UI-164606, a copy of Order No. 21-UI-164606, a copy of Order No. 21-UI-165381, and a cover letter. *See* EAB Exhibit 1.

(13) In the cover letter, claimant stated she was "writing to request [the] PUA benefits that I was entitled to per the court hearing in April 2021." EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. Claimant explained her efforts to contact the

---

<sup>1</sup> EAB has taken notice of these facts, which are contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1). Any party that objects to our taking notice of this information 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 noticed fact will remain in the record.

Department and OAH regarding the PUA benefits. EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. Claimant stated that OAH “sent me all the documents” and pointed out that Order No. 21-UI-165381 “clearly says that I was granted the PUA benefits from June 2020- February 2021.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. Then, in a reference to Order No. 21-UI-164606, which dismissed claimant’s appeal of decision # 71131, claimant stated, “It says that I submitted my appeal late but I never received any documents until March of 2021.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. Claimant then referenced the March 8, 2021 hearing request referral that the Department had treated as both a late appeal of decision # 71131 and a timely appeal of the February 19, 2021 PUA determination, stating, “When I received the documents I filed for appeal right away on March 8, 2021 and it was scheduled and I was told I will receive those benefits in April 2021 so I’m not sure why now I still haven’t received them.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. Claimant concluded by stating, “I am submitting all the documents sent to [m]e [b]y [the] court saying that I did qualify for benefits and I am hoping to receive th[e] benefits that belong to me.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant’s application for review is a late application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381. Claimant’s late application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381 is allowed. Order No. 21-UI-165381 is set aside and this matter is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

**Late Application for Review.** “An application for review may be filed on forms provided by OAH or the Employment Department and other similar offices in other states. Use of the form is not required, provided the applicant requests review of a specific ALJ Order, or otherwise expresses intent to appeal an ALJ Order.” OAR 471-041-0060(1) (May 13, 2019). An application for review is timely if it is filed within 20 days of the date that the Office of Administrative Hearings (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 first issue is to decide whether claimant’s application for review is an application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381, the order concluding that claimant was entitled to receive PUA benefits for weeks 26-20 through 07-21. Because claimant’s submission expresses an intent to appeal Order No. 21-UI-165381, claimant’s application for review is an application for review of that order.

On March 18, 2024, claimant faxed a submission that consisted, in pertinent part, of a copy of decision # 71131, the hearing request referral that the Department had treated as requesting a hearing on both decision # 71131 and the February 19, 2021 PUA determination, a completed application for review form, a completed appellant questionnaire response that had been attached to Order No. 21-UI-164606, a copy of Order No. 21-UI-164606, a copy of Order No. 21-UI-165381, and a cover letter. On balance, claimant’s submission favors the view that she expressed an intent to appeal Order No. 21-UI-165381.

Claimant’s cover letter is the best evidence of claimant’s intent and it repeatedly states that claimant’s goal is to receive the PUA benefits to which Order No. 21-UI-165381 concluded she was entitled. The letter leads off with “I am . . . writing to request [the] PUA benefits that I was entitled to per the court

hearing in April 2021.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. The letter points out, accurately, that Order No. 21-UI-165381 “clearly says that I was granted the PUA benefits from June 2020- February 2021.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. The letter references claimant’s March 8, 2021, hearing request and says “I filed for an appeal right way” and “it was scheduled and I was told I will receive those benefits in April 2021 so I’m not sure why now I still haven’t received them.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. The letter concluded by stating “I am submitting all the documents sent to [m]e [b]y [the] court saying that I did qualify for benefits and I am hoping to receive th[e] benefits that belong to me.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1.

Having concluded that claimant’s application for review is an application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381, the next issue to address is whether to allow claimant’s late application for review of that order. The deadline to file a timely application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381 was May 12, 2021. Because claimant did not file her application for review until March 18, 2024, the application for review is late.

Claimant established good cause to allow the late application for review. Claimant received a favorable result from Order No. 21-UI-165381, in that it concluded that claimant was entitled to receive PUA benefits for weeks 26-20 through 07-21. Following the order’s issuance, claimant “sent multiple requests to the Employment [D]epartment requesting an update[.]” and “kept on getting a response that they are working on it.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. While seeking an update, claimant expected the Department to eventually comply and had no reason to think she had to appeal Order No. 21-UI-165381 in an effort to receive the benefits awarded to her. Claimant’s reasonable expectation that the Department would act in compliance with ALJ Monroe’s order, coupled with the Department’s failure to comply, were factors beyond claimant’s reasonable control that caused her to be unable to file timely. These factors persisted through February 2024, when claimant called the Department and spoke with a representative who, apparently referring to decision # 71131’s conclusion that claimant was not eligible for regular UI benefits, stated that claimant “will not be receiving a payout” of her PUA benefits “because [her] benefits were denied.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. At the Department representative’s suggestion, claimant then contacted OAH for more information, and following that effort, OAH “sent [claimant] all the documents,” including both Order No. 21-UI-165381 and Order No. 21-UI-164606. EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. The receipt of both orders did not cause the reasonable expectation that the Department would comply with Order No. 21-UI-165381 to cease, nor did it make it transparent what mechanism claimant had to address the Department’s apparent failure to comply with a valid order, and so the factors beyond claimant’s reasonable control that prevented a timely filing continued until claimant’s March 18, 2024 application for review filing date. Thus, claimant showed good cause to extend the timely filing deadline to that date and filed within a reasonable time. The late application for review therefore is allowed.

Having allowed claimant’s late application for review of Order No. 21-UI-165381, the third issue to address is whether the application for review should be dismissed because it does not present a justiciable controversy. Typically, where a claimant files an application for review of an order that allowed the claimant benefits, the application for review is subject to dismissal because the claimant does not assign error to any portion of the order or allege facts that could entitle them to further relief. Here, Order No. 21-UI-165381 concluded that claimant was entitled to receive PUA benefits for weeks 26-20 through 07-21. Yet, more than three years later, the Department has not paid claimant those benefits and the Department’s claim records show no recognition that the April 21, 2021, hearing was conducted or that Order No. 21-UI-165381 concluded that claimant was entitled to PUA benefits. Under these circumstances, claimant has asserted a reasonable basis on which she is entitled to further relief.

Claimant's application for review therefore presents a justiciable controversy and is not subject to dismissal.

**PUA Eligibility.** To be eligible for PUA benefits, an individual must be a "covered individual" as that term is defined by the CARES Act, as amended. 15 U.S.C. § 9021(b). In pertinent part, a "covered individual" is an individual who (1) "is not eligible for regular compensation or extended benefits . . . or pandemic emergency unemployment compensation" and (2) self-certifies that they are either "otherwise able to work and available for work within the meaning of applicable State law, except the individual is unemployed, partially unemployed, or unable or unavailable to work because" of one of eleven reasons related to the COVID-19 pandemic, or "is self-employed, is seeking part-time employment, does not have sufficient work history, or otherwise would not qualify for regular unemployment" and is rendered unemployed because of one of the eleven listed reasons. 15 U.S.C. § 9021(a)(3)(A)(i)-(ii).

The order under review found that claimant had a valid regular UI claim and had claimed and was paid regular UI benefits for the weeks of March 29, 2020, through June 20, 2020 (weeks 14-20 through 25-20). Order No. 21-UI-165381 at 1. The order found that the Department issued decision # 71131 concluding that, due to her self-employment activities, claimant was not available for work and therefore was ineligible for regular UI benefits from week 26-20 through the expiration of her regular UI claim. Order No. 21-UI-165381 at 2. The order concluded that for weeks 26-20 through 07-21, claimant was entitled to PUA benefits because decision # 71131 rendered her not eligible for regular UI benefits during those weeks and her housecleaning business was significantly diminished because of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Order No. 21-UI-165381 at 4-5. The order distinguished weeks 14-20 through 25-20, for which claimant had received regular UI benefits, from weeks 26-20 through 07-21, making clear that claimant was entitled to PUA benefits only for the latter set of weeks. Order No. 21-UI-165381 at 5.

The Department did not appeal Order No. 21-UI-165381. Despite the finality of that order, there is no explanation apparent in Department records as to why the claim was not paid in accordance with the order in the three years following the order's issuance.

Remand is necessary to request a representative for the Department to appear and explain why it did not pay claimant PUA benefits for weeks 26-20 through 07-21 as required by Order No. 21-UI-165381. If the reason the Department did not pay claimant is because the Department disagreed with Order No. 21-UI-165381's legal conclusion, the ALJ should inquire why the Department did not file an application for review of the order with EAB. If the Department did not pay claimant because of an error, the ALJ should inquire whether the Department intends to correct the error and make prompt payment. To this end, the ALJ should make inquiries to verify that claimant in fact made a weekly claim for PUA benefits for week 29-20, which Department records appear to show claimant did not claim,<sup>2</sup> as well as for week 03-21, which, at hearing, the Department representative expressed doubt that claimant had claimed. Transcript at 15.

---

<sup>2</sup> EAB has taken notice of these facts, which are contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1). Any party that objects to our taking notice of this information 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 noticed fact will remain in the record.

At hearing, the Department’s representative encouraged claimant to file weekly claims for PUA benefits after week 07-21. Transcript at 15 (“So the Claimant should start filing her weekly claims as of week 08/21 and all the weeks moving forward.”). Department records suggest that claimant claimed PUA benefits each week continuously after week 07-21.<sup>3</sup> Because the February 19, 2021, PUA determination concluded that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits for an indefinite period, the ALJ should address jurisdictional issues on remand to determine if there are additional weeks claimed but not addressed in Order No. 21-UI-165381 to resolve. If so, the ALJ should ask questions to develop whether claimant is eligible to receive PUA benefits for any weeks she claimed after week 07-21. The ALJ should inquire whether the Department on remand contests claimant’s eligibility for PUA benefits for any of these additional weeks, and if so, on what basis. If the Department contests claimant’s eligibility for PUA benefits on the basis that claimant was monetarily eligible for regular UI, the ALJ should inquire why claimant’s ineligibility for regular UI based on her self-employment activities did not make her “not eligible for regular compensation” within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 9021(a)(3)(A)(i) so as to make claimant a “covered individual” eligible to receive PUA benefits.

Also, to any extent the Department contests claimant’s eligibility for PUA benefits, the ALJ should consider whether the Department is precluded from taking that position on remand given that the Department did not appeal Order No. 21-UI-165381 and the Department’s representative in the original hearing conceded claimant’s entitlement to PUA. Specifically, at the hearing on April 20, 2021, the Department’s representative testified, in reference to the effect of decision # 71131, that, subject to asking some questions to clarify claimant’s “Covid impact date” claimant “could be eligible for PUA after her denial date for the regular UI claim, which is June 21, 2020.” Transcript at 6. The representative answered in the affirmative when asked, “[S]o long as the [c]laimant meets the regular PUA eligibility requirements, she would be essentially eligible for PUA benefits after June 21, 2020?” Transcript at 7. And, near the end of the hearing, when asked whether claimant answered questions about her Covid impact date to the satisfaction of the Department, the representative testified “Yeah, I understand the claimant’s history of – of leaving work and – and why” and “we have the information we need to qualify her for PUA.” Transcript at 14-15.

For the above reasons, Order No. 21-UI-165381 is reversed, and this matter is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

**DECISION:** Order No. 21-UI-165381 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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

**DATE of Service:** May 1, 2024

---

<sup>3</sup> EAB has taken notice of these facts, which are contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1). Any party that objects to our taking notice of this information 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 noticed fact will remain in the record.

**NOTE:** The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Order No. 21-UI-165381 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، وإذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الاستئناف بأوريغون وذلك باتباع 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.