

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2024-EAB-0317-R

Reconsideration Allowed
Late Application for Review of Order No. 24-UI-249937 Dismissed
EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 Adhered to on Reconsideration

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On October 13, 2023, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was discharged for misconduct and was disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective July 16, 2023 (decision # 145634). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On November 1, 2023, ALJ Goodrich conducted a hearing, and on November 9, 2023, issued Order No. 23-UI-240868, affirming decision # 145634. On November 17, 2023, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB). On January 5, 2024, EAB issued EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1273, reversing Order No. 23-UI-240868 and remanding the matter for further development of the record.

On January 31, 2024, ALJ Goodrich conducted a hearing on remand at which the employer failed to appear, and on March 12, 2024, issued Order No. 24-UI-249937, affirming decision # 145634. On March 27, 2024, claimant filed an application for review with EAB. On May 10, 2024, EAB issued EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317, reversing Order No. 24-UI-249937 by concluding that claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct, and claimant was not disqualified from receiving benefits based on the work separation.

On July 9, 2024, the employer filed a late application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937 that EAB initially construed as a late request for reconsideration of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317. On July 12, 2024, EAB denied employer's July 9, 2024, submission by letter. On August 1, 2024, the employer filed a late request to reconsider EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317. This decision is issued pursuant to EAB's authority under ORS 657.290(3).

EVIDENTIARY MATTER: EAB has considered two additional sources of evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). EAB marks as EAB Exhibit 2 employer's August 1, 2024, correspondence requesting reconsideration of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317. EAB marks as EAB Exhibit 3 employer's July 9, 2024, late application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937. Copies of EAB Exhibit 2 and 3 are provided to the parties with this decision. Any party that

objects to our admitting EAB Exhibit 2 or 3 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) Equifax was a company that provided third-party administrator services to employers in unemployment insurance matters. Equifax provided these services through various subordinate entities, including Equifax Workforce Solutions and Employers Edge. The address of record for employers assigned to Equifax Workforce Solutions is in St. Louis, Missouri. The address of record for employers assigned to Employers Edge is in Westminster, Colorado.

(2) The employer, the United States Postal Service, used Equifax as a third-party administrator in unemployment insurance matters.

(3) In June 2022, Equifax “migrated [its] Federal accounts” including the employer “to a new system . . . and with the migration” assigned the employer to Employers Edge. EAB Exhibit 3 at 6. With the migration, Equifax “had the Federal directory,” which included the employer, updated to the address for Employers Edge in Colorado. EAB Exhibit 3 at 6. Due to error, the Department listed employer’s address of record as Equifax using the St. Louis, Missouri address instead of listing Equifax’s Employers Edge and using their address in Colorado. EAB Exhibit 3 at 5.

(4) On October 13, 2023, the Department issued the administrative decision in this matter, decision # 145634. The Department mailed employer’s copy of the administrative decision to Equifax’s address in Missouri. Claimant filed a request for hearing on the decision with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). On October 20, 2023, OAH served notice of a hearing on decision # 145634 for November 1, 2023. OAH mailed employer’s copy of the notice of hearing to Equifax’s Missouri address.

(5) On October 27, 2023, Equifax emailed the employer’s manager of labor relations for Idaho-Montana-Oregon district (who was also claimant’s manager) of the hearing scheduled for November 1, 2023. November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 24:08. On October 31, 2023, an Equifax employee also sent a copy of the notice of hearing to the employer’s attorney by email. November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 7:33.

(6) On November 1, 2023, the first hearing in this matter occurred. Employer appeared and was represented by their attorney. Employer’s manager of labor relations for Idaho-Montana-Oregon district, who was notified of the hearing by Equifax, also appeared and testified on employer’s behalf. Near the beginning of the hearing, the following exchange occurred:

ALJ: Can you confirm, . . . , that the address on the notice of hearing that the employer the United States Postal Service received is a good mailing address?

The employer’s attorney: Mmm.

ALJ: Let me tell you what that is . . . , it’s PO Box, Equifax Workforce Solutions for: United States Postal Service . . . St. Louis, Missouri 63166.¹

¹ The specific PO Box number is omitted for privacy.

The employer's attorney: I can't confirm one way or the other if that's a good address.

The employer's witness: Your Honor, this is [the employer's witness], this is [the employer's witness], that is accurate.

ALJ: Okay, thank you. The bottom line is that's where my decision at the end of this proceeding is going to go.

November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 2:48 to 3:12. Neither employer's attorney nor employer's witness, the manager of labor relations for Idaho-Montana-Oregon district, attempted to correct or update the employer's address from Equifax's Missouri address to Equifax's Employers Edge address in Colorado. The attorney did not provide any other address to use to either reach him personally or the employer despite the explicit knowledge that the ALJ would mail his order to the employer at the Missouri address.

(7) The issue of employer's address was raised once more when employer's attorney argued he was not able to serve claimant with documents in advance of the hearing because he had only received the hearing notice the previous day. November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 20:21. In response, the following exchange occurred:

ALJ: I'm looking at the notice of hearing, it says it was mailed by the Office of Administrative Hearings on October 20, 2023, to the address I previously confirmed which is Equifax Workforce Solutions for USPS . . . St. Louis Missouri 63166. Now I know [the employer's witness] stated that that is the proper address for purposes of sending my order, um, are you telling me, sir, that Equifax Workforce Solutions who apparently received mail related to this issue, did not receive the notice of hearing until yesterday or is that just you, sir?

The employer's attorney: uh, I can't speak to the mailing because I do not know about the mailing.

November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 20:37 to 21:17. After further discussion, the ALJ proceeded with the hearing. Again, neither employer's attorney nor employer's witness, attempted to correct or update the employer's address from Equifax's Missouri address to Equifax's Employers Edge address in Colorado. There were no attempts made to supplement the record with an address to use to reach either employer's attorney personally or the employer.

(8) On November 9, 2023, the ALJ issued Order No. 23-UI-240868 and mailed employer's copy to the Missouri address confirmed at the hearing. On November 17, 2023, claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 23-UI-240868. On January 5, 2024, EAB issued EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1273, reversing Order No. 23-UI-240868 and remanding the matter for further development of the record. EAB mailed employer's copy of EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1273 to the Missouri address.

(9) On January 18, 2024, OAH served notice of a remand hearing on decision # 145634, scheduled for January 31, 2024. Employer's copy of the notice of hearing was mailed to the Missouri address. On January 31, 2024, the employer failed to appear at the remand hearing. On March 12, 2024, the ALJ issued Order No. 24-UI-249937, affirming decision # 145634. OAH mailed employer's copy of Order No. 24-UI-249937 to the Missouri address. On March 27, 2024, claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937. On May 10, 2024, EAB issued EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317, reversing

Order No. 24-UI-249937 by concluding that claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct. EAB mailed employer's copy of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 to the Missouri address.

(10) On July 9, 2024, the same employee for Equifax who sent the notice of hearing to employer's attorney before the November 1, 2023, hearing, filed a submission with EAB. *See* EAB Exhibit 3. The submission stated that employer did not receive EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1273 or the notice of hearing mailed January 18, 2024, because they were mailed to the Missouri address and requested that the January 31, 2024, remand hearing be reopened. EAB Exhibit 3 at 2. The submission also attached a copy of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317, and an email exchange between a manager at Equifax Workforce Solutions and a Department representative. EAB Exhibit 3 at 5-13.

(11) EAB treated the July 9, 2024, submission as a late request for reconsideration of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 because it was not filed within 20 days of the date the decision was mailed. On July 12, 2024, EAB sent a letter to the employer that the July 9, 2024, submission was construed as a reconsideration request, and that EAB would take no further action because it was not timely filed.

(12) On August 1, 2024, the same Equifax employee filed another submission with EAB, purporting to appeal EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 and again attaching the email exchange between a manager at Equifax Workforce Solutions and a Department representative acknowledging the address error, and requesting that EAB reverse EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317. *See* EAB Exhibit 2 at 2-5. EAB regards the August 1, 2024, submission as a request to reconsider EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Reconsideration is allowed. On reconsideration, the employer's July 9, 2024, submission is considered an application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937, which is dismissed as late without good cause. EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 is adhered to on reconsideration.

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." "Any party may request reconsideration to correct an error of material fact or law, or to explain any unexplained inconsistency with Employment Department rule, or officially stated Employment Department position, or prior Employment Department practice." OAR 471-041-0145(1) (May 13, 2019). 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).

The employer's August 1, 2024, submission is regarded as a request to reconsider EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317. The August 1, 2024, submission failed to meet OAR 471-041-0145(2)'s requirements that the reconsideration request be filed within 20 days of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317's mailing date and include a statement that a copy of the request was provided to the other party.

However, EAB is authorized to grant reconsideration on its own motion under ORS 657.290(3) and granting reconsideration via that authority is not subject to the requirements of OAR 471-041-0145(2). Granting reconsideration per ORS 657.290(3) is warranted to correct EAB's error of considering the employer's July 9, 2024, submission to be a request for reconsideration. For the reasons set forth below, the employer's July 9, 2024, submission is properly regarded as a late application for review of Order

No. 24-UI-249937. For these reasons, reconsideration is allowed. However, as further explained below, EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 is adhered to on reconsideration.

Application for Review of Order No. 24-UI-249937. The employer styled their July 9, 2024, submission as a “Request to Reopen Board Hearing” and the employer’s goal in filing it was to have the January 31, 2024, hearing on remand in this matter reopened so that the employer could participate. Pursuant to OAR 471-041-0060(4) and (5), where an application for review is filed by a party that failed to appear at the hearing, the application for review is treated as a request to reopen, except that, in a case of a party that failed to appear and whose failure to appear did not cause the hearing request initiating the appeal to be dismissed, the submission will be treated as an application for review if: (a) the party states in the application for review that they are not requesting to reopen the hearing; or (b) the application for review does not include a written statement stating the reason(s) the party missed the hearing. Here, the employer appeared at the initial hearing, but missed the January 31, 2024, hearing on remand, they were not the party who requested the hearing so their absence did not result in the hearing request being dismissed, and they mention in their July 9, 2024, submission both that they wish to reopen the January 31, 2024 hearing and reasons why they missed the hearing.

Therefore, under OAR 471-041-0060(4) and (5), the July 9, 2024, submission would be treated as a request to reopen so long as it was an application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937 that was filed late with good cause. 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). “An application for review may be filed in person, or by mail, fax, or electronic means to EAB[.]” OAR 471-041-0070(2) (May 13, 2019).

Per OAR 471-041-0060(1), for the employer’s July 9, 2024, submission to constitute an application for review, the submission needed to have “expresse[d] intent to appeal an ALJ Order[.]” Given the circumstances here, the July 9, 2024, submission met that standard. The submission seeks what it terms a “reopen[ing]” of “this case” so that “this matter [can] be re-opened” and “the case can be heard on the merits.” EAB Exhibit 3 at 2. This conveys a desire not only to be granted a new remand hearing but also for the determinations rendered by Order No. 24-UI-249937 and EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 be vacated, and the merits of the case to be decided anew. Given that the employer’s request would necessarily render void the merits determinations that followed the January 31, 2024, hearing, including that of Order No. 24-UI-249937, the language of the submission is sufficient to express an intent to appeal that order. Therefore, the July 9, 2024, submission constituted an application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937.

Late Application for Review. 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). 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 deadline to file an application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937 was April 1, 2024. Because the employer did not file their application for review until July 9, 2024, the application for review was late.

The information contained in the employer's July 9, 2024, submission shows that in June 2022, the employer's third-party administrator, Equifax, assigned the employer to its subsidiary entity Employers Edge, with an address in Colorado. Due to error, the Department's records listed employer's administrator's address as the Missouri address instead of the Colorado address. The Department shared this incorrect address with OAH and EAB. This caused the initial administrative decision and Notice of Hearings in the case and subsequent orders and decisions to be sent to the wrong address for Equifax. It is regrettable that these mailing errors occurred. Nevertheless, in light of events that occurred in this case after the Department made the initial determination, the employer failed to establish good cause for filing the application for review late.

First, as of October 27, 2023, the employer's third-party administrator, Equifax, knew or should have known about the address error and could have taken steps to correct the error. OAH mailed the notice scheduling the November 1, 2023, hearing to the address for Equifax Workforce Solutions in Missouri. Although this was a wrong address, the appropriate subsidiary or employee within Equifax ultimately received the notice because on October 27, 2023, they sent an email to the employer's manager advising of an upcoming hearing on claimant's appeal. This caused the manager and the employer's attorney to call Equifax regarding the fact the notice had not been uploaded to Equifax's portal, and ultimately led to the employer's attorney receiving a copy of the notice of hearing from an Equifax employee via email. The attorney appeared at the hearing the next day as the employer's representative, and in the course of explaining his difficulties receiving the notice, mentioned the Equifax employee who had emailed him the notice. November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 7:38. The Equifax employee the attorney mentioned in the hearing is the *same* individual who filed the employer's July 9, 2024, submission, and is described in that document as an Appellate Specialist for Equifax's subsidiary, Employers Edge. EAB Exhibit 3 at 2.

It is therefore evident that despite the error in mailing the hearing notice to the address in Missouri, an Equifax employee received the notice and conveyed the notice to the employer's attorney in sufficient time for the attorney and the employer's manager to appear at the hearing. Having received calls from the attorney and manager about the hearing notice, Equifax would be aware at that time, or at least capable of becoming aware by looking at the notice's certificate of mailing that showed the incorrect address, that the issue responsible for the mailing error was that the notice had been mailed to Missouri instead of Colorado. It was then within the reasonable control of Equifax to contact the Department or OAH to correct the address error, which would likely have prevented the subsequent mailing errors from occurring, including Order No. 24-UI-249937 being mailed to the Missouri address. Because Equifax is the employer's third-party administrator, Equifax's failure to correct the address error at or promptly following when it was known or knowable to them is attributable to the employer. The failure to take action to notify the Department or OAH of the address error that, by October 27, 2023, was known or knowable to the employer's third-party administrator, rendered the employer's subsequent failure to receive Order No. 24-UI-249937 a circumstance that was not beyond the employer's reasonable control.

Next, at the November 1, 2023, hearing, the ALJ read the Missouri address from the notice of hearing to the employer's attorney and their manager of labor relations, asked if it was correct, and the employer's participants at the hearing confirmed that it was correct. The attorney was acting as the employer's representative at the hearing and the manager was participating as a witness. The attorney stated he could not confirm one way or the other whether the Missouri address was correct. However, the manager stated that the address was accurate, and the attorney did not correct the manager or request an opportunity to verify the address before proceeding further. The ALJ reminded the employer's participants at that time that the Missouri address was where the hearing order would be mailed. Later in the hearing, while asking the attorney a question, the ALJ repeated the Missouri address, and reiterated that the manager had confirmed it, which led the attorney to state, "I can't speak to the mailing because I do not know about the mailing." November 1, 2023, Audio Record at 21:21.

Thus, the employer's participants at the hearing had ample opportunity to correct the address error but failed to do so. Although the attorney professed to lack knowledge of the proper mailing address, and employer's manager confirmed the address, the attorney had a responsibility to ensure that representations made to the ALJ about the employer's address of record were accurate. It is typically expected that a representative will appear at hearing prepared to verify the address of record of the party they represent, or, if they are not sure of the correct address, request an opportunity to verify it. The attorney did not correct the manager's error or request from the ALJ an opportunity to verify the address himself, by, for example, emailing back the Equifax employee who had sent him the hearing notice the day before to inquire whether the Missouri address was correct. Taking this reasonable step, either during the hearing with the ALJ's permission or promptly after the hearing's conclusion, would have enabled the attorney to correct the address and ensure that future mailings were properly mailed to the Colorado address. It was therefore within the reasonable control of the employer, through their attorney representative at hearing, to correct the address error at or shortly after the November 1, 2023, hearing, which would have prevented the subsequent mailing errors from occurring, including Order No. 24-UI-249937 being mailed to the incorrect Equifax subsidiary at the Missouri address. For these reasons, the delay in the employer receiving a copy of Order No. 24-UI-249937, or their failure to receive it at all, was not due to a circumstance beyond the employer's reasonable control.

Finally, even if the employer had established that a factor beyond their reasonable control prevented filing of the application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937 by April 1, 2024, they failed to show that the July 9, 2024, application for review filing date was within a seven-day reasonable time of when such factors ceased to exist. In the employer's July 9, 2024, submission, the employer stated that they did not receive the EAB decision that ordered a remand hearing, EAB Decision 2023-EAB-1273, nor the notice of that hearing, EAB Exhibit 3 at 2. The submission does not mention whether the employer received Order No. 24-UI-249937 but does attach a copy of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317. Thus, although EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 was incorrectly mailed to Missouri instead of Colorado, the appropriate subsidiary or employee within Equifax ultimately received it, just like they ultimately received the initial Notice of Hearing. Upon the employer's receipt of EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317, the employer would have been on notice of the existence of Order No. 24-UI-249937 and their opportunity to appeal it, and any factor preventing a timely appeal of Order No. 24-UI-249937 would have ceased. As the employer's July 9, 2024, submission is silent as to when the employer received EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317, they failed to show that their July 9, 2024, late application for review was filed within a seven-day reasonable time of when any factors beyond their reasonable control preventing a timely filing had ceased.

For the above reasons, the employer's July 9, 2024, submission was an application for review, but it was late without good cause. Because the application for review was late without good cause, the submission is not treated as a request to reopen under OAR 471-041-0060(4) and (5). Accordingly, the employer's July 9, 2024, late application for review is dismissed. EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 is adhered to on reconsideration.

DECISION: Reconsideration is allowed. The employer's late application for review of Order No. 24-UI-249937, filed July 9, 2024, is dismissed. EAB Decision 2024-EAB-0317 is adhered to on reconsideration.

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

DATE of Service: August 21, 2024

NOTE: You may appeal this decision by filing a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals within 30 days of the date of service listed above. *See* ORS 657.282. For forms and information, you may write to the Oregon Court of Appeals, Records Section, 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97310 or visit the Court of Appeals website at courts.oregon.gov. Once on the website, use the 'search' function to search for 'petition for judicial review employment appeals board'. A link to the forms and information will be among the search results.

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



Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Traditional Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Tagalog

Paalala – Nakakaapekto ang desisyong ito sa iyong mga benepisyo sa pagkawala ng trabaho. Kung hindi mo naiintindihan ang desisyong ito, makipag-ugnayan kaagad sa Lupon ng mga Apela sa Trabaho (Employment Appeals Board). Kung hindi ka sumasang-ayon sa desisyong ito, maaari kang maghain ng isang Petisyon sa Pagsusuri ng Hukuman (Petition for Judicial Review) sa Hukuman sa Paghahabol (Court of Appeals) ng Oregon na sinusunod ang mga tagubilin na nakasulat sa dulo ng desisyon.

Vietnamese

Chú ý - Quyết định này ảnh hưởng đến trợ cấp thất nghiệp của quý vị. Nếu quý vị không hiểu quyết định này, hãy liên lạc với Ban Kháng Cáo Việc Làm ngay lập tức. Nếu quý vị không đồng ý với quyết định này, quý vị có thể nộp Đơn Xin Tái Xét Tư Pháp với Tòa Kháng Cáo Oregon theo các hướng dẫn được viết ra ở cuối quyết định này.

Spanish

Atención – Esta decisión afecta sus beneficios de desempleo. Si no entiende esta decisión, comuníquese inmediatamente con la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo. Si no está de acuerdo con esta decisión, puede presentar una Aplicación de Revisión Judicial ante el Tribunal de Apelaciones de Oregon siguiendo las instrucciones escritas al final de la decisión.

Russian

Внимание – Данное решение влияет на ваше пособие по безработице. Если решение Вам непонятно – немедленно обратитесь в Апелляционный Комитет по Трудоустройству. Если Вы не согласны с принятым решением, вы можете подать Ходатайство о Пересмотре Судебного Решения в Апелляционный Суд штата Орегон, следуя инструкциям, описанным в конце решения.

Khmer

ចំណុចសំខាន់ – សេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះមានផលប៉ះពាល់ដល់អត្ថប្រយោជន៍គ្មានការងារធ្វើរបស់លោកអ្នក។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់អំពីសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ សូមទាក់ទងគណៈកម្មការឧទ្ធរណ៍ការងារភ្លាមៗ។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់ស្របចំពោះសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះទេ លោកអ្នកអាចដាក់ពាក្យប្តឹងសុំឲ្យមានការពិនិត្យរឿងក្តីឡើងវិញជាមួយតុលាការឧទ្ធរណ៍រដ្ឋ Oregon ដោយអនុវត្តតាមសេចក្តីណែនាំដែលសរសេរនៅខាងចុងបញ្ចប់នៃសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ។

Laotian

ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ – ຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້ມີຜົນກະທົບຕໍ່ກັບເງິນຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອການຫວ່າງງານຂອງທ່ານ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້, ກະລຸນາຕິດຕໍ່ຫາຄະນະກຳມະການອຸທອນການຈ້າງງານໃນທັນທີ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຫັນດີນໍາຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້, ທ່ານສາມາດຍື່ນຄໍາຮ້ອງຂໍການທົບທວນຄໍາຕັດສິນນໍາສານອຸທອນລັດ Oregon ໄດ້ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄໍາແນະນໍາທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້.

Arabic

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فوراً، و إذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار.

Farsi

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از دستور العمل موجود در پایان آن، از دادگاه تجدید نظر اورگان درخواست تجدید نظر کنید.

Employment Appeals Board - 875 Union Street NE | Salem, OR 97311
 Phone: (503) 378-2077 | 1-800-734-6949 | Fax: (503) 378-2129 | TDD: 711
www.Oregon.gov/Employ/eab

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.