

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2024-EAB-0296

Reversed & Remanded

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On January 19, 2024, 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 August 13, 2023 (decision # 110841). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On February 28, 2024, ALJ Christon conducted a hearing at which the employer failed to appear, and on March 4, 2024, issued Order No. 24-UI-249402, affirming decision # 110841. On March 22, 2024, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant did not declare that she provided a copy of her argument to the opposing party or parties as required by OAR 471-041-0080(2)(a) (May 13, 2019). The argument also contained information that was not part of the hearing record, and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond claimant's reasonable control prevented her from offering the information during the hearing as required by OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019). EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing when reaching this decision. *See* ORS 657.275(2).

The parties may offer new information, such as the new information contained in claimant's written argument and the documents attached thereto, into evidence at the remand hearing. At that time, it will be determined if the new information will be admitted into the record. The parties must follow the instructions on the notice of the remand hearing regarding documents they wish to have considered at the hearing. These instructions will direct the parties to provide copies of such documents to the ALJ and the other parties in advance of the hearing at their addresses as shown on the certificate of mailing for the notice of hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Bay Equity Northwest employed claimant as a loan officer assistant from March 27 until August 18, 2023. Bay Equity Northwest paid claimant, on average, \$6,916 per month, which was derived from a base salary of \$6,041 per month plus a bonus of \$125 per loan filed each month. Claimant averaged seven loans filed per month.

(2) Prior to August 1, 2023, a mortgage company called Secured Processing expressed interest in offering claimant a job as a loan processor. To offer the job to claimant, Secured Processing required

claimant to pass a background check. In the week before August 1, 2023, claimant submitted to the background check.

(3) Claimant had a preplanned, week-long vacation to Canada with her daughter scheduled for the week beginning August 20, 2023, which was the week before her daughter's school began.

(4) On August 1, 2023, claimant successfully passed the background check and Secured Processing offered claimant the job. Claimant accepted Secured Processing's job offer the same day. Because claimant wished to give Bay Equity Northwest two weeks' notice and had the preplanned, week-long vacation with her daughter scheduled for the week beginning August 20, 2023, Secured Processing scheduled claimant's job to begin on August 28, 2023. On August 1, 2023, claimant gave the employer Bay Equity Northwest notice of her intent to resign effective August 15, 2023. Claimant's manager asked that claimant stay until August 18, 2023 because she needed claimant's help. Claimant agreed to do so and changed her resignation date to be effective August 18, 2023.

(5) At the time Secured Processing offered the job to claimant, claimant "was told it was contract, and that was basically it[.]" Transcript at 11-12. Secured Processing "told [claimant] how the pay would work" including that claimant would get paid on Friday of each week based on the contracts that had closed by Wednesday of each week. Transcript at 22. The amount of claimant's pay was linked to "what the . . . contract amount was per file[.]" Transcript at 14.

(6) Claimant believed the Secured Processing job had the "potential" to earn her \$10,000 or more per month. Transcript at 7. Claimant had worked in the mortgage industry for a long time, had previously been a processor, and believed earning "\$10,000 plus" was "the income potential of what [she] was used to making as a processor." Transcript at 11. However, Secured Processing did not offer claimant a guarantee of earnings. Claimant had been referred to Secured Processing by a group of loan officers who worked for Secured Processing and with whom claimant had worked previously, and some of those individuals told claimant they earned "more than \$10,000 plus" at Secured Processing. Transcript at 13. However, those individuals were loan officers whereas claimant was to be a processor, a role that is in support of loan officers and their clients. Claimant did not speak to any processors at Secured Processing before accepting the job. Claimant concluded that she would have the potential to earn \$10,000 or more per month with Secured Processing after she "kinda estimated, based on what [she] was told," and on "what the . . . contract amount was per file as well." Transcript at 14.

(7) Claimant believed that the Secured Processing job was "contract work" that would "give [her] more flexibility" and in which she would be "working for [her]self basically." Transcript at 11, 22. The job would be performed in an online environment, working from home via claimant's own computer using Secured Processing's software, with an email account provided by Gmail, and with the processing manager available to help by teleconference. The processing manager would be available if claimant had questions and to help market claimant by making statements to others such as "hey[,] I have a great processor . . . you should give her a try[.]" Transcript at 28. Claimant did not receive any tax documents from Secured Processing but believed she was in a "1099" relationship with them. At Secured Processing's suggestion, claimant hired an assistant, whom claimant interviewed and selected herself. Secured Processing did not provide claimant any healthcare or retirement benefits. However, claimant did not establish a business entity with the Secretary of State to take the Secured Processing job, she did

not get insurance or indemnify Secured Processing against loss, and she was not permitted to perform services for other mortgage companies while performing the job for Secured Processing.

(8) On August 28, 2023, claimant began the job with Secured Processing. Claimant underwent a two-week, unpaid training that began that day. At the end of the unpaid training, claimant stopped performing the job for Secured Processing because she received an offer of work from a different entity, Rivermark Credit Union. Because claimant's tenure with Secured Processing consisted entirely of the two-week, unpaid training, claimant was never actually paid anything by Secured Processing.

(9) In October 2023, Rivermark Credit Union terminated claimant's employment, and claimant filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits. The Department determined claimant had a monetarily valid claim with a weekly benefit amount of \$812, which was equivalent to \$3,518.67 per month.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 24-UI-249402 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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

A claimant who leaves work to accept an offer of other work "has left work with good cause only if the offer is definite and the work is to begin in the shortest length of time as can be deemed reasonable under the individual circumstances. Furthermore, the offered work must reasonably be expected to continue, and must pay [either] an amount equal to or in excess of the weekly benefit amount, or an amount greater than the work left." OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a). In pertinent part, the Department does not consider a job offer to be definite "if [it] is contingent upon . . . [such things as] passing a drug test, background check, credit check, and/or an employer receiving a contract." Oregon Employment Department, UI Benefit Manual § 442 (Rev. 04/01/10). Under the Department's interpretation of OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a), the provision does not apply where an individual leaves work for self-employment. *See* UI Benefit Manual § 442 ("The provisions of -0038(5)(a) do not apply when a person leaves to become self-employed. OAR 471-030-0038(5)(b)(G) specifically addresses leaving work for self-employment as being not good cause."). The applicable provision in that situation is OAR 471-030-0038(5)(b)(G), which provides that leaving work without good cause includes "[l]eaving work for self employment."

The order under review concluded that in resigning from the employer to accept the Secured Processing job, claimant left work to accept an offer of other work. Order No. 24-UI-249402 at 2. The order therefore applied OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a) and concluded that claimant quit work without good cause because she failed to show that the offer of work for Secured Processing was definite, or that the work

was to begin in the shortest length of time reasonable under the circumstances. Order No. 24-UI-249402 at 2-3. The order also concluded that claimant did not establish that Secured Processing's offer paid an amount equal to or in excess of claimant's weekly benefit amount or an amount greater than the work claimant left. Order No. 24-UI-249402 at 3. The record as currently developed does not support these conclusions. Remand is necessary to assess whether this case is governed by OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a) or by OAR 471-030-0038(5)(b)(G) and, if the former, to assess whether claimant fulfilled the elements of OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a).

Leaving Work to Accept an Offer of Other Work. As an initial matter, as to OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a), the record evidence is sufficient to conclude that claimant satisfied the element requiring the work to begin in the shortest length of time as can be deemed reasonable under the individual circumstances. Claimant accepted the Secured Processing job on August 1, 2023. However, she could not begin the job during her resignation notice period, which, at the request of her manager, claimant agreed to extend from August 15, 2023 to August 18, 2023. From there, claimant had a preplanned, week-long vacation with her daughter scheduled for the week beginning August 20, 2023. Typically, where a claimant takes time between the old and new work not out of necessity, it cannot be said that the work is to begin in the shortest length of time reasonable under the circumstances. Here, however, given that the vacation with her daughter was preplanned and scheduled to occur the week before the daughter went back to school, the record supports the inference that claimant had incurred costs that could not be refunded and that the daughter's school obligations made rescheduling the vacation difficult or impossible. Under those circumstances, arranging the Secured Processing job to begin after the vacation was reasonable, and claimant therefore met the element requiring the work to begin in the shortest length of time reasonable under the circumstances.

As to whether the Secured Processing job offer was definite, there were no unfulfilled contingencies at the time claimant quit working for Bay Equity Northwest. Secured Processing required claimant to pass a background check, but claimant successfully did so as of August 1, 2023. However, based on the record as currently developed, it remains possible that at the time claimant quit working for Bay Equity Northwest, the Secured Processing job offer was indefinite because the structure of claimant's pay was unknown or not sufficiently defined.

At hearing, very little evidence was developed regarding how claimant's compensation was structured. At the time Secured Processing offered the job to claimant, "they told [claimant] how the pay would work" including that claimant would get paid on Friday of each week based on the contracts that had closed by Wednesday of each week. Transcript at 22. The amount of claimant's pay was linked to "what the . . . contract amount was per file[.]" Transcript at 14. Otherwise, when asked about any guarantee of earnings or dollar amount, claimant testified simply, "I was told it was contract, and that was basically it[.]" Transcript at 11-12.

On remand, the ALJ should ask claimant about the compensation structure of the Secured Processing job. The ALJ should ask questions to verify there was no base or guaranteed compensation. The ALJ should ask if claimant was to be paid a percentage of the processing fee assessed on the contract or loan closed, and if so, what that percentage was and what the processing fee assessed on the closed contract or loan was to be, and how many contracts claimant estimated she would close each month, and what she based that estimate on. To the extent claimant offers documentary evidence on remand that sheds light on claimant's compensation structure, and such documents are admitted into the record, the ALJ

should make inquiries based on any relevant information contained therein. Moreover, the record suggests that following the two-week unpaid training, the Secured Processing job was to continue indefinitely. Nevertheless, on remand, the ALJ should make inquiries necessary to establish that the job was reasonably be expected to continue, such as whether it was a permanent position or of limited duration, and whether it was part-time or full-time.

The final element of OAR 471-030-0038(5)(a) is whether the Secured Processing job likely paid either an amount equal to or in excess of the weekly benefit amount, or an amount greater than the work left. Claimant had worked in the mortgage industry for a long time, had previously been a processor, and believed earning “\$10,000 plus” was “the income potential of what [she] was used to making as a processor.” Transcript at 11. Claimant was referred to Secured Processing by a group of loan officers who worked there and with whom she had worked before, and some of those individuals told claimant they earned “more than \$10,000 plus” per month at Secured Processing. Transcript at 13. However, those individuals were loan officers whereas claimant was to be a processor, which is a role that supports loan officers and their clients. Claimant did not speak to any processors at Secured Processing before accepting the job, she talked only with the processing manager. Claimant concluded that she would have the potential to earn \$10,000 or more per month with Secured Processing after she “kinda estimated, based on what [she] was told,” and on “what the . . . contract amount was per file as well.” Transcript at 14.

On remand, the ALJ should ask claimant to explain how the \$10,000 plus per month earnings mentioned to her by the loan officers who worked at Secured Processing was an accurate measure of what claimant would earn, given that those individuals were loan officers whereas claimant was to be a processor. The ALJ should ask claimant to elaborate on the information, including what specifically she “was told,” that factored into her estimation that she would have the potential to earn \$10,000 or more per month in the Secured Processing job. The ALJ should ask how many contracts claimant reasonably expected to close per month, and what the amounts on the contracts were to be. Once the record is developed further regarding the source and reliability of claimant’s belief that she had the potential to earn \$10,000 or more per month with Secured Processing, the ALJ should assess whether claimant’s Secured Processing pay would likely was greater than her \$6,916 per month pay from Bay Equity Northwest, or likely was at least equal or exceed her weekly benefit amount of \$3,518.67 per month.¹

Leaving Work for Self-Employment. Under OAR 471-030-0038(5)(b)(G), leaving work without good cause includes “[l]eaving work for self employment.” Aspects of the record suggest that the Secured Processing job was self-employment. Claimant thought she would be “working for [her]self” and that the job would “give [her] more flexibility.” Transcript at 11, 22. The job would occur in an online environment, in which claimant would use her own computer to perform the services, with a processing manager available to help answer questions and to “market” claimant. Transcript at 28. To help with the Secured Processing job, claimant hired an assistant whom she interviewed and selected herself. Claimant believed she was in a “1099” relationship with Secured Processing and Secured Processing did not provide claimant any healthcare or retirement benefits. Transcript at 7, 22. At hearing, when asked “were you going to have freedom to do things the way that you wanted to, providing services to clients?” claimant responded, “That’s gonna be a yes and no” because she would be “trained on their way of doing things,” but “you create your own process as well, what works for you and your team[.]”

¹ \$812 weekly benefit amount x 52 weeks / 12 months = \$3,518.67.

Transcript at 21. Ultimately, when asked “So did [you] believe you’d be essential[ly] self-employed at Secured Processing?”, claimant answered affirmatively. Transcript at 22.

Other facts suggest that the Secured Processing job was not self-employment. For example, claimant did not establish a business entity with the Secretary of State to take the Secured Processing job, she did not get insurance or indemnify Secured Processing against loss, and she was not permitted to perform services for other mortgage companies while performing services for Secured Processing.

Guidance indicates that the Department interprets an individual to be self-employed for purposes of OAR 471-030-0038(5)(b)(G) if they are an independent contractor. UI Benefit Manual § 443 (Rev. 04/01/10) (“Anyone who leaves work to enter into or pursue work as an independent contractor (self-employment) has left work without good cause”). Whether the Secured Processing job constituted self-employment therefore appears to turn largely on whether claimant was an independent contractor.

Per ORS 657.040(1), a person is an independent contractor if they meet the definition of that term as defined in ORS 670.600. ORS 670.600(2) defines “independent contractor” as follows:

As used in ORS [chapter] * * * 657 * * *, “independent contractor” means a person who provides services for remuneration and who, in the provision of the services:

- (a) Is free from direction and control over the means and manner of providing the services, subject only to the right of the person for whom the services are provided to specify the desired results;
- (b) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, is customarily engaged in an independently established business;
- (c) Is licensed under ORS chapter 671 or 701 if the person provides services for which a license is required under ORS chapter 671 or 701; and
- (d) Is responsible for obtaining other licenses or certificates necessary to provide the services.

As to subpart (a) above, under OAR 471-031-0181(3)(a) (February 1, 2007), the following criteria is used to determine whether a person is “free from direction and control over the means and manner of providing” services to others:

(A) “Means” are resources used or needed in performing services. To be free from direction and control over the means of providing services an independent contractor must determine which resources to use in order to perform the work, and how to use those resources. Depending upon the nature of the business, examples of the “means” used in performing services include such things as tools or equipment, labor, devices, plans, materials, licenses, property, work location, and assets, among other things.

(B) “Manner” is the method by which services are performed. To be free from direction and control over the manner of providing services an independent contractor must determine how to perform the work. Depending upon the nature of the business, examples of the "manner" by which services are performed include such things as work schedules, and work processes and procedures, among other things.

(C) “Free from direction and control” means that the independent contractor is free from the right of another person to control the means or manner by which the independent contractor provides services. If the person for whom services are provided has the right to control the means or manner of providing the services, it does not matter whether that person actually exercises the right of control.

Furthermore, as to the independently established business element set forth by ORS 670.600(2)(b), per ORS 670.600(3), a person is considered to be customarily engaged in an independently established business if any three of the following requirements are met:

(a) The person maintains a business location:

(A) That is separate from the business or work location of the person for whom the services are provided; or

(B) That is in a portion of the person’s residence and that portion is used primarily for the business.

(b) The person bears the risk of loss related to the business or the provision of services as shown by factors such as:

(A) The person enters into fixed-price contracts;

(B) The person is required to correct defective work;

(C) The person warrants the services provided; or

(D) The person negotiates indemnification agreements or purchases liability insurance, performance bonds or errors and omissions insurance.

(c) The person provides contracted services for two or more different persons within a 12-month period, or the person routinely engages in business advertising, solicitation or other marketing efforts reasonably calculated to obtain new contracts to provide similar services.

(d) The person makes a significant investment in the business, through means such as:

(A) Purchasing tools or equipment necessary to provide the services;

(B) Paying for the premises or facilities where the services are provided; or

(C) Paying for licenses, certificates or specialized training required to provide the services.

(e) The person has the authority to hire other persons to provide or to assist in providing the services and has the authority to fire those persons.

On remand, as an initial matter, the Department should consider having a representative from the Department's Contributions and Recovery or Tax division appear to testify as to whether the Department considers Secured Processing to be a subject employer. If such a witness appears, the ALJ should inquire whether the Department considers Secured Processing to be a business that uses independent contractors, to be an employer who employs employees in an employment relationship, or if it uses both independent contractors and employees.

Otherwise, the ALJ should ask questions to develop the record regarding the independent contractor criteria listed above. Specifically, as to ORS 670.600(2)(a), the ALJ should inquire whether claimant was free from direction and control over the means and manner of providing the Secured Processing services by asking questions based on OAR 471-031-0181(3)(a). This means the ALJ should ask, among other questions, whether Secured Processing had the right to control the resources claimant used or needed in performing services or the method by which claimant was to perform services for Secured Processing. Further, as to ORS 670.600(2)(b), the ALJ should ask questions based on ORS 670.600(3) to determine whether claimant customarily engaged in an independently established business. This inquiry should involve questions to develop whether claimant's work from home arrangement constituted maintaining a business location, and the extent of claimant's investment, if any, in equipment or licensure, as well as any additional questions based on subparts (b), (c), or (e) of ORS 670.600(3). Further, as to ORS 670.600(2)(c), the ALJ should develop the record to confirm that claimant's Secured Processing job did not involve licensure required under ORS Chapter 671 (Architects; Landscape Professionals) or Chapter 701 (Construction Contractors and Contracts). As to ORS 670.600(2)(d), the ALJ should inquire whether claimant was responsible for obtaining any license or certificate necessary to provide the processor services for Secured Processing.

Finally, note that the "independent contractor" criteria set forth in ORS 670.600 and OAR 471-031-0181 are guidance, and not necessarily dispositive of whether the Secured Processing job was self-employment. As such, the ALJ should ask any other questions not otherwise captured via the independent contractor inquiry that are necessary to develop the record as to whether the Secured Processing job constituted self-employment.

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 quit work without good cause, Order No. 24-UI-249402 is reversed, and this matter is remanded.

DECISION: Order No. 24-UI-249402 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: May 6, 2024

NOTE: The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Order No. 24-UI-249402 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.