

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2024-EAB-0610

Affirmed
Overpayment Assessed

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On June 9, 2022, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant received \$868 in regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) and \$1,200 in Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) benefits to which she was not entitled and must repay (decision # 193632). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On November 28, 2023, the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) served a notice of hearing scheduled for December 8, 2023. On December 8, 2023, claimant failed to appear for the hearing, and ALJ Adamson issued Order No. 23-UI-242982, dismissing the hearing request due to claimant's failure to appear, leaving decision # 193632 undisturbed.

On December 11, 2023, claimant filed a timely request to reopen the December 8, 2023, hearing. On March 12, 2024, the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) mailed a letter stating that Order No. 23-UI-242982 was vacated and that a new hearing would be scheduled to determine whether to allow claimant's request to reopen and, if so, the merits of decision #193632. On August 5, 2024, ALJ Lucas conducted a hearing at which the employer failed to appear, and on August 13, 2024, issued Order No. 24-UI-262345, allowing claimant's request to reopen and affirming decision #193632. On August 21, 2024, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant made numerous submissions to EAB by email, many of which constitute written arguments. First, on August 26, 2024, claimant forwarded an email that she had originally sent to ALJ Lucas, expressing her view that she was rushed through the August 5, 2024, hearing because time went to the Department's witness, and as a result was unable to discuss each document that she had offered that had been admitted into evidence by the ALJ. EAB considered this argument in reaching this decision.

At hearing, the ALJ admitted Exhibits 7 through 16, consisting of dozens of pages of documents offered by claimant that primarily relate to allegations she made against the employer of employment discrimination, a matter that is not relevant or material to the narrow issues in this case, except to the extent they bear on claimant's mental state, and explain why she may have provided false information that caused her to receive benefits to which she was not entitled. In addition to receiving claimant's

documentary evidence into the record, the ALJ elicited extensive testimony from claimant and permitted her to call and take testimony from two additional witnesses, all over the course of a hearing that lasted nearly two hours. While pauses occurred during the hearing because the Department's witness experienced computer problems, the record shows that less than 10 minutes of the hearing was lost due to these pauses. *See* Audio Record at 31:12 to 32:06, 37:32 to 39:21, 41:30 to 41:50, 43:26 to 45:52, and 47:06 to 49:09. For these reasons, after having reviewed the hearing record in its entirety, the record shows that the ALJ inquired fully into the matters at issue and gave all parties reasonable opportunity for a fair hearing as required by ORS 657.270(3) and (4) and OAR 471-040-0025(1) (August 1, 2004).

Next, on August 27, 2024, claimant sent an email advising that she intended to send to EAB the documents already admitted into evidence by the ALJ as Exhibits 7 through 16. On September 1 and 2, 2024, claimant did so, in a series of over 20 emails. In each of these emails, claimant introduced each document with a written argument. EAB considered these arguments in reaching this decision.

However, attached to one of claimant's September 2, 2024, emails, claimant offered information she termed as a "New Statement of Non-Remembrance." This statement 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. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019), EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing when reaching this decision and so did not consider the "New Statement of Non-Remembrance."

Finally, on September 24, 2024, claimant made another submission to EAB consisting, in pertinent part, of a one-page written argument and a four-page Social Security Administration document dated May 17, 2023. EAB considered the one-page written argument in reaching this decision. The four-page Social Security Administration document contained information that was not part of the hearing record, and claimant did not show that factors or circumstances beyond her reasonable control prevented her from offering the information during the hearing. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090, EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing when reaching this decision, and so did not consider the Social Security Administration document. EAB also did not consider the Social Security Administration document because, under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090(1)(b)(A), the document was not relevant and material to EAB's determination whether claimant received benefits to which she was not entitled and is liable for an overpayment.

In her September 24, 2024, written argument, claimant first contended that her overpayments should be excused because, when she filed her weekly claim forms and reported that she had not worked each week (when in fact she had worked and received earnings), her conduct was an isolated instance of poor judgment under OAR 471-030-0038(3)(b) (September 22, 2020). This argument is without merit. The isolated instances of poor judgment rule applies only when an employer discharges a claimant. It can be asserted by a claimant to establish that their violation of an employer's policy that caused the employer to discharge them was not misconduct connected with work, and that their discharge therefore does not disqualify them from receiving benefits. The isolated instances of poor judgment rule cannot be asserted to excuse someone from liability for an overpayment.

Next, claimant expressed concern that the employer, Lees-McRae College, was a party to this case given claimant's allegations that the employer subjected her to employment discrimination. Claimant produced

voluminous evidence at hearing relating to her work environment and alleged discriminatory treatment by the employer during the weeks at issue. However, except for the narrow issue of claimant's state of mind when she claimed benefits, whether the employer subjected claimant to unlawful discrimination is not relevant or material to the issues in this case. Furthermore, the employer did not appear at hearing or make any apparent effort to participate in this case. The only apparent impact the employer had on this case was, per the Department's witness, that the employer provided claimant's hours and earnings information to the Department in response to a benefits audit the Department issued while investigating this matter. Transcript at 13. Claimant agreed with the earnings information obtained from the audit. Transcript at 20, 24-26. Thus, claimant did not show that the employer's status as a party to this case was improper or unfairly prejudiced her in any way.

Lastly, claimant argues multiple times that she should be excused from liability for the overpayment. Claimant should take note that on June 29, 2022, the Department waived recovery of claimant's \$868 regular UI overpayment. Transcript at 8. Therefore, claimant has been excused from liability as to the regular UI overpayment in the sense that the Department will not seek to recover it. Further, although the Department's representative testified at hearing that claimant's FPUC overpayment is "non-waivable," waiver of FPUC overpayments is available under federal law if certain criteria are met. Transcript at 8; *See* 15 U.S.C. § 9023(f). Claimant may wish to submit a waiver application to the Department and make clear that the waiver application is intended to apply to her FPUC overpayment. If claimant pursues this course of action, the Department may deny her FPUC overpayment waiver request. However, the Department is required under OAR 471-030-0053(7) (June 23, 2024) to issue an administrative decision if it denies a waiver request, and such an administrative decision may be appealed. *See* OAR 471-030-0053(7) ("If a request for waiver of recovery is denied, the individual will receive an administrative decision as defined in OAR 471-030-0039.").

EAB considered the entire hearing record. EAB agrees with the portion of Order No. 24-UI-262345 allowing claimant's request to reopen. Pursuant to ORS 657.275(2), that portion of Order No. 24-UI-262345 is **adopted**. The remainder of this decision relates to claimant's overpayment of regular UI and FPUC benefits.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On June 25, 2021, claimant filed an initial claim for regular unemployment insurance (regular UI) benefits. The Department determined that claimant had a monetarily valid claim with a weekly benefit amount of \$217.

(2) Claimant claimed benefits for the weeks from August 8 through September 4, 2021 (weeks 32-21 through 35-21). These are the weeks at issue.

(3) For each of the weeks at issue, claimant completed a weekly continued claim form through the Department's online claims system. Each weekly claim form asked the question, "Did you work last week, or, did you receive or will you receive vacation or holiday pay for the week?" Exhibit 5 at 22, 25, 28, 31.

(4) Claimant worked 40 hours and earned \$1,214.29 for each of the weeks at issue. However, for each of the weeks, claimant answered "no" to the question, "Did you work last week, or, did you receive or will you receive vacation or holiday pay for the week?" Exhibit 5 at 22, 25, 28, 31.

(5) For each of the weeks at issue, the Department paid claimant \$217 in regular UI benefits and \$300 in FPUC benefits, for a total of \$868 of regular UI benefits and \$1,200 of FPUC benefits. Had claimant correctly answered “yes” to the question, “Did you work last week or, did you receive or will you receive vacation or holiday pay for the week?” and accurately reported her hours and earnings on her claim forms for each of the weeks at issue, claimant would not have received benefits.

(6) Claimant incorrectly answered “no” to the question, “Did you work last week” on her claim forms for each of the weeks at issue because she “was in a place of mental disarray” due to treatment from her employer that she believed constituted religious discrimination. Transcript at 23. Specifically, during the weeks at issue, claimant believed she was subjected to antisemitism and found it “very difficult to keep [her] mind straight[.]” Transcript at 26. Claimant regarded her work environment as “an extreme situation of hostility” that made her “frantic.” Transcript at 26. The work environment also caused claimant to “reach[] for sort of [a] normative routine” and answer “no” to the question as “a habitual thing.” Transcript at 26.

(7) The Department audited the employer and received claimant’s hours and earnings information for the weeks at issue. On June 9, 2022, the Department issued decision # 193632, concluding that claimant received \$868 in regular UI and \$1,200 FPUC benefits to which she was not entitled and must repay. However, decision # 193632 did not conclude that claimant had made false statements willfully to obtain the benefits she had been overpaid.

(8) On June 29, 2022, the Department waived recovery of claimant’s \$868 regular UI overpayment.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 24-UI-262345 is affirmed. Claimant was overpaid \$868 in regular UI benefits and is liable under 657.310(1)(a) to repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable, although the Department has waived the \$868 regular UI overpayment and therefore will not seek to recover it. Claimant is liable for an overpayment of \$1,200 in FPUC benefits to be recovered in accordance with the same procedures as apply to recovery of claimant’s regular UI overpayment.

As a preliminary matter, the issues on appeal in this case are narrow and involve only whether claimant is liable for an overpayment of regular UI and FPUC benefits received during the weeks at issue. Claimant produced voluminous evidence at hearing relating to her work environment and alleged discriminatory treatment by the employer during the weeks at issue. This evidence is relevant only to the extent it bears on claimant’s state of mind when she claimed benefits, and has been considered for that purpose. The issues in this case do not involve whether the employer’s treatment of claimant constituted employment discrimination, and this decision does not address that matter.

Remuneration. An individual is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits if they are not unemployed. ORS 657.155(1)(e) (“An *unemployed individual* shall be eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week. . .”) (emphasis added). Per ORS 657.100(1), as modified by Oregon House Bill 3178, signed into law by the Governor on May 17, 2021, and effective for the weeks of May 23, 2021, through January 1, 2022 (weeks 21-21 through 52-21), an individual is deemed “unemployed”:

in any week during which the individual performs no services and with respect to which no remuneration for services performed is paid or payable to the individual, or in any week of less than full-time work.

Here, claimant worked 40 hours and earned \$1,214.29 for each of the weeks at issue. Because claimant worked full-time each week,¹ she was not “unemployed” within the meaning of ORS 657.100(1) for any of the weeks at issue, and therefore was not eligible for benefits with respect to any of those weeks.

Even if claimant had been an eligible unemployed individual during the weeks at issue, she would not have been eligible for regular UI benefits for any of the weeks at issue because her benefits for the weeks at issue would be subject to a reduction to zero based on the earnings she received during each week. ORS 657.150(6), as modified by Senate Bill 1701, signed into law by the Governor on September 1, 2020, and effective September 6, 2020, through January 1, 2022 (weeks 37-20 through 52-21), provides as follows:

An eligible unemployed individual who has employment in any week shall have the individual’s weekly benefit amount reduced, but not below zero, by the amount of earnings paid or payable that exceeds the greater of:

(a) \$300; or

(b) One-third of the individual’s weekly benefit amount.

Applying ORS 657.150(6), as modified by Senate Bill 1701, for each of the weeks at issue, claimant’s weekly benefit amount was \$217. One-third of \$217 is \$72.33. The greater of \$300 or \$72.33 is \$300. The amount of claimant’s \$1,214.29 earnings for each week that exceeded \$300 was \$914.29. Claimant’s \$217 weekly benefit amount for each of the weeks at issue would therefore be subject to a dollar-for-dollar reduction by \$914.29, which would reduce the benefit amount for each week to zero.

For these reasons, claimant’s hours and earnings during the weeks at issue rendered her ineligible for benefits for those weeks.

Overpayment of Regular UI benefits. ORS 657.310(1)(a) provides that an individual who received benefits to which the individual was not entitled is liable to either repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to the individual under ORS chapter 657. That provision applies if the benefits were received because the individual made or caused to be made a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, or failed to disclose a material fact, regardless of the individual’s knowledge or intent. *Id.*

Claimant received \$217 in regular UI benefits for each of the weeks at issue, for a total of \$868 of regular UI benefits. Claimant was not “unemployed” within the meaning of ORS 657.100(1) for any of the weeks at issue and therefore was not eligible for these benefits. The record shows that claimant

¹ Per OAR 471-030-0022 (January 11, 2018), “‘full-time work,’ for the purposes of ORS 657.100, is 40 hours of work in a week except in those industries, trades or professions in which most employers due to custom, practice, or agreement utilize a normal work week of more or less than 40 hours in a week.”

received the benefits because she made a false statement of material fact each of the weeks at issue by answering “no” to the question, “Did you work last week, or, did you receive or will you receive vacation or holiday pay for the week?” Had claimant correctly answered “yes” to that question, and accurately reported her hours and earnings on her claim forms for each of the weeks at issue, claimant would not have received benefits.

While answering “no” to the question was a false statement of material fact that caused claimant to receive benefits to which she was not entitled, the record is sufficient to conclude that claimant answered “no” without knowledge or intent to provide false information. This is the case because, during the weeks at issue, claimant “was in a place of mental disarray” due to treatment from her employer that she believed constituted religious discrimination. Transcript at 23. Claimant found it “very difficult to keep [her] mind straight” and believed her work environment was “an extreme situation of hostility” that made her “frantic.” Transcript at 26. Claimant answered “no” to the question as “a habitual thing” and not to provide false information knowingly or intentionally. For these reasons, claimant’s regular UI overpayment is governed by ORS 657.310(1)(a).

Claimant should take note that her overpayment is not a fraud or willful misrepresentation overpayment. This is so because claimant’s false statements were made without her knowledge or intent, and not willfully to obtain benefits. Fraud overpayments are governed by ORS 657.215, require the making of false statements willfully to obtain benefits, and involve the imposition of penalties that are not applicable here.

Accordingly, claimant is liable to repay the \$868 regular UI overpayment or have the amount of the benefits overpaid deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable. Under ORS 657.310(1)(c), the overpayment may be collected by the Department within five years following the week in which the decision establishing the erroneous payment becomes final. Please note that although claimant is technically liable for the regular UI overpayment, on June 29, 2022, the Department waived recovery of claimant’s \$868 regular UI overpayment. Therefore, the Department will not seek to recover the \$868 regular UI overpayment.

Overpayment of FPUC benefits. Under the provisions of the CARES Act, 15 U.S.C. § 9023, claimant also received FPUC benefits to which she was not entitled. FPUC is a federal benefits program that provided eligible individuals with \$300 per week, in addition to their regular UI weekly benefit amount, during the period of December 27, 2020, through September 4, 2021 (weeks 52-20 through 35-21). *See* U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 15-20 (April 4, 2020) at 6, (UIPL 15-20). Individuals were eligible to receive the full \$300 FPUC benefit if they were eligible to receive at least one dollar of regular UI benefits for the claimed week. UIPL 15-20 at I-5.

Because claimant was not eligible for at least one dollar of regular UI benefits for any of the weeks at issue, she also was ineligible for FPUC benefits for those weeks. *See* UIPL 15-20 at I-7 (“If an individual is deemed ineligible for regular compensation in a week and the denial creates an overpayment for the entire weekly benefit amount, the FPUC payment for the week will also be denied. And the FPUC overpayment must also be created.”). Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 9023(f)(2), an individual who receives FPUC payments to which the individual was not entitled is liable to repay those benefits, unless the Department waives such repayment because it determines that the payment of those benefits

was without fault on the part of the individual and such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. The record does not show the Department has waived repayment here.

Claimant therefore is liable for the overpayment of \$1,200 in FPUC benefits she received during the weeks at issue. Under United States Department of Labor guidance, while an FPUC overpayment may be offset by other State and Federal unemployment benefits payable during the three year period following the date an individual receives the FPUC benefits to which they are not entitled, State agencies “must recover the amount of FPUC to which an individual was not entitled in accordance with the same procedures as apply to recovery of overpayments of regular [UI] paid by the State.” UIPL 15-20 at I-7. Specifically, “After three years, a State may continue to recover FPUC overpayments through means other than benefit offsets, according to State law.” UIPL 15-20 at I-7. Accordingly, because the provision of state law governing claimant’s regular UI overpayment is ORS 657.310(1)(a) and (c), claimant is liable to repay the amount of her FPUC overpayment or have it deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to claimant under ORS Chapter 657 during the five-year period following the date decision # 193632 becomes final.

To summarize, Order No. 24-UI-262345 is affirmed. Claimant is liable for an overpayment of \$868 in regular UI benefits and is liable to repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from future benefits payable during the five-year period following the date decision # 193632 becomes final. However, the Department has waived the \$868 regular UI overpayment and therefore will not seek to recover it. Claimant is also liable for an overpayment of \$1,200 in FPUC benefits to be recovered in accordance with the same procedures as apply to recovery of claimant’s regular UI overpayment.

DECISION: Order No. 24-UI-262345 is affirmed.

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

DATE of Service: September 26, 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.

NOTE: **The Department may defer recovery or completely waive the overpaid amount if certain standards are met.** If you apply but do not qualify for a waiver, other relief may be available, such as temporarily pausing collection efforts or limiting reductions of current benefits. It is important to apply for a waiver as soon as possible because waivers are not retroactive. **For more information on requesting a waiver, go to <https://unemployment.oregon.gov/overpayments> or call 503-947-1995.**

The Overpayment Waiver Application is available for download at <https://unemployment.oregon.gov/uploads/docs/FORM129-EN.pdf> and can be submitted in any of these ways:

- **Frances Online: Log in to your Frances Online account and use “Send a Message”**
- **Use the Contact Us form online at: unemployment.oregon.gov/contact**
- **Email: UIOverpayments@employ.oregon.gov – Subject: “Waiver Request”**
- **Fax: 503-947-1811 – ATTN: BPC Waiver Requests**
- **U.S. Mail: BPC Overpayment Waivers, PO Box 14130, Salem, OR 9731**

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.