EO: Intrastate
BYE: 03-May-2025

State of Oregon
Employment Appeals Board
875 Union St. N.E.
Salem, OR 97311

673
DS 005.00

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2025-EAB-0069

Order No. 24-UI-279960 Reversed ~ No Disqualification
Orden Judicial No. 24-UI-279960 Revocada ~ No Descalificación

Order No. 24-UI-279062 Affirmed ~ Request for Hearing Dismissed
Orden Judicial No. 24-UI-279062 Confirmada ~ La Solicitud de Audiencia es Rechazada

Este documento incluye información importante que no ha sido traducida al español. Llame a la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo (EAB) al 503-378-2077 para obtener servicios de traducción gratuitos.[1]

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On June 3, 2024, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was discharged for misconduct, and therefore was disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective March 31, 2024 (decision # L0004347575). On June 4, 2024, the Department served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant's right to benefits based on wages earned prior to the work separation addressed in decision # L0004347575 would not be cancelled, despite the employer having reported that he was discharged for theft, because claimant did not admit to the theft and was not convicted of theft (decision # L0004422679). Claimant filed timely requests for hearing on both administrative decisions.

On January 7, 2025, ALJ Frank convened a consolidated hearing on both decisions interpreted in Spanish. Prior to the start of testimony, claimant made a statement, which was construed as a request to withdraw his request for hearing on decision # L0004422679. ALJ Frank then proceeded to hear the merits of decision # L0004347575. On January 7, 2025, ALJ Frank issued Order No. 25-UI-279062, dismissing claimant's request for hearing on # L0004422679 due to the withdrawal request. On January 15, 2025, ALJ Frank issued Order No. 25-UI-279960, affirming decision # L0004347575 on the merits. On January 16, 2025, claimant filed applications for review of Orders No. 25-UI-279960 and 25-UI-279062 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

[1] This document includes important information that has not been translated into Spanish. Please call the Employment Appeals Board (EAB) at 503-378-2077 to obtain free translation services.

Pursuant to OAR 471-041-0095 (October 29, 2006), EAB consolidated its review of Orders No. 25-UI-279960 and 25-UI-279062. For case-tracking purposes, this decision is being issued in duplicate (EAB Decisions 2025-EAB-0069 and 2025-EAB-0068).

HISTORIAL PROCESAL: *El 3 de junio de 2024, el Departamento de Empleo de Oregón (el Departamento) envió por correo una decisión administrativa que concluyó que el reclamante fue despedido por mala conducta y, por lo tanto, fue descalificado de recibir beneficios de seguro de desempleo a partir del 31 de marzo de 2024 (decisión L0004347575). El 4 de junio de 2024, el Departamento mandó otra decisión administrativa que concluyó que el derecho del reclamante a los beneficios basados en salarios ganados antes de la separación laboral en cuestión en la decisión L0004347575 no sería cancelado, a pesar de que el empleador había informado que fue despedido por robo, porque el reclamante no admitió el robo y no fue condenado por robo (decisión # L0004422679). El reclamante presentó solicitudes oportunas de audiencia sobre las dos decisiones administrativas.*

El 7 de enero de 2025, el juez administrativo Frank convocó a una audiencia consolidada sobre las dos decisiones. La audiencia fue interpretada al español. Antes del inicio del testimonio, el reclamante hizo una declaración, que se interpretó como una solicitud para retirar su solicitud de audiencia sobre la decisión # L0004422679. El juez Frank luego procedió a tomar información sobre los méritos de la decisión # L0004347575. El 7 de enero de 2025, ALJ Frank emitió la Orden Judicial No. 25-UI-279062, desestimando la solicitud de audiencia del reclamante sobre el # L0004422679 debido a la solicitud de retiro. El 15 de enero de 2025, ALJ Frank emitió la Orden Judicial No. 25-UI-279960, confirmando la decisión # L0004347575 sobre los méritos de la decisión. El 16 de enero de 2025, el reclamante presentó solicitudes de revisión de las Órdenes Judiciales No. 25-UI-279960 y 25-UI-279062 ante la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo (EAB).

De conformidad con Regla Administrativa de Oregón (OAR) 471-041-0095 (29 de octubre de 2006), la EAB consolidó su revisión de las Órdenes Judiciales No. 25-UI-279960 y 25-UI-279062. Para fines de seguimiento de casos, esta decisión se emite en duplicado (Decisiones EAB 2025-EAB-0069 y 2025-EAB-0068).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: EAB did not consider claimant's written argument when reaching this decision because he did not include a statement declaring that he provided a copy of his argument to the opposing party or parties as required by OAR 471-041-0080(2)(a) (May 13, 2019).

ARGUMENTO ESCRITO: *EAB no consideró el argumento escrito del reclamante al llegar a esta decisión porque el argumento no incluyó una declaración que declarara que proporcionó una copia de su argumento a la parte o partes opuestas como lo requiere Regla Administrativa de Oregón (OAR) 471-041-0080(2)(a) (13 de mayo de 2019).*

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Epson Portland, Inc. employed claimant as a material handler in their warehouse department from April 6, 1999 through April 3, 2024.

(2) By policy, employees were permitted to take used wooden pallets from the warehouse for their own use if the employer was otherwise finished with the pallets. Before taking pallets from the warehouse, the employer required an employee to obtain permission from their supervisor to take the pallets, and to

complete and submit a "material movement form" for the pallets they were taking. Transcript at 8. Claimant was aware of and understood these requirements.

(3) The employer also maintained a policy which, for safety reasons, prohibited employees from operating equipment such as forklifts without another employee present. Claimant was aware of and understood this policy.

(4) On the mornings of October 14, 2023 and February 3, 2024, both Saturdays, claimant and a coworker entered the employer's warehouse and, using one of the employer's forklifts, removed several used wooden pallets that the employer was finished with. The facility was not in operation on weekends, and both employees were there on their own time. Claimant and the other employee then sold the pallets for $2.50 each and split the proceeds. Prior to taking the pallets on each occasion, claimant obtained permission from his supervisor to do so. Additionally, claimant completed material movement forms on each occasion. However, while claimant turned the completed form into the facility's security guard on the first occasion, the security guard told claimant on February 3, 2024 that claimant did not need to turn in the form, so claimant did not do so.

(5) In or around March 2024, the employer learned that claimant entered the warehouse on the two above-mentioned dates when they reviewed their access-control data. On March 28, 2024, the employer's human resources (HR) representative met with claimant to discuss claimant having entered the warehouse on those dates. During the meeting, claimant admitted he took pallets and that he had material movement forms to do so, per the policy. Transcript at 10. Afterwards, the employer looked for copies of claimant's material movement forms, and found one for October 14, 2023, but was unable to find one for February 3, 2024.

(6) On March 31, 2024, claimant texted his supervisor, stating, "I just wanted to see if you can tell them that you give [*sic*] me the okay to use the forklift because you knew we were coming in on Saturdays to pick up the pallets[.]" Transcript at 19. Claimant's supervisor responded, "I can't lie about it. Sorry, man." Transcript at 19. The supervisor reported the exchange to the employer.

(7) On April 3, 2024, the employer discharged claimant because they concluded claimant did not have permission from his supervisor to use the forklift to take the pallets and because the employer believed that he had been untruthful during the investigation when he asked his supervisor to tell the employer that he had permission to use the forklift because the supervisor knew he was coming in on Saturdays to pick up the pallets.

(8) On June 4, 2024, the Department issued decision # L0004422679, which determined that claimant's right to benefits based on wages earned prior to the separation addressed in decision # L0004347575 would not be cancelled, despite the employer's having reported that claimant was discharged for theft, because claimant did not admit to the theft and was not convicted of theft. Claimant filed a timely request for hearing on that decision.

(9) On January 7, 2025, before the start of the hearing, the ALJ asked claimant if he had intended to appeal a decision that was favorable to him. Audio Record at 3:00. Claimant responded, "no," which the ALJ interpreted to mean that claimant wished to withdraw his request for hearing on decision # L0004422679. Audio Record at 3:20.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct, and is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on the work separation. Claimant's request for hearing on decision # L0004422679 is dismissed.

CONCLUSIONES Y RAZONES: *El reclamante fue despedido, pero no por mala conducta, y no está descalificado para recibir los beneficios del seguro de desempleo debido a la separación laboral. Se desestima la solicitud del reclamante de audiencia sobre la decisión # L0004422679.*

Discharge. ORS 657.176(2)(a) requires a disqualification from unemployment insurance benefits if the employer discharged claimant for misconduct connected with work. "As used in ORS 657.176(2)(a) . . . a willful or wantonly negligent violation of the standards of behavior which an employer has the right to expect of an employee is misconduct. An act or series of actions that amount to a willful or wantonly negligent disregard of an employer's interest is misconduct." OAR 471-030-0038(3)(a) (September 22, 2020). "'[W]antonly negligent' means indifference to the consequences of an act or series of actions, or a failure to act or a series of failures to act, where the individual acting or failing to act is conscious of his or her conduct and knew or should have known that his or her conduct would probably result in a violation of the standards of behavior which an employer has the right to expect of an employee." OAR 471-030-0038(1)(c). In a discharge case, the employer has the burden to establish misconduct by a preponderance of evidence. *Babcock v. Employment Division*, 25 Or App 661, 550 P2d 1233 (1976).

The employer discharged claimant because they determined claimant failed to obtain permission and fill out a material movement form before taking pallets, because they believed he operated a forklift while alone, and because the employer believed that claimant had been untruthful during their investigation. Order No. 25-UI-279960 concluded that this constituted misconduct, explaining that claimant "did not obtain permission to do what he did, though he falsely reported otherwise to the employer and then unsuccessfully requested that a supervisor support this account with a falsehood of his own." Order No. 25-UI-279960 at 4. The record does not support this conclusion.

The record shows that the employer permitted employees to take pallets for personal use when the employer otherwise intended to dispose of them. Thus, claimant's having taken the pallets on October 14, 2023 and February 3, 2024 did not, itself, violate the employer's expectations. Instead, the employer alleged that claimant violated their policies requiring employees to obtain permission and fill out material movement forms prior to taking pallets and forbidding the operation of forklifts while alone. Additionally, the employer alleged that claimant had been untruthful with the employer during the investigation by asking his supervisor to tell the employer that the supervisor had given him permission to take the pallets.[2] The employer did not meet their burden to show that claimant acted as the employer alleged, or that, if he did act as alleged as to failing to turn in the second material movement form, that his having done so constituted misconduct.

Regarding claimant's having obtained permission to take the pallets, the employer's evidence that claimant had not obtained permission consisted of a text message exchange between claimant and his supervisor on March 31, 2024. In that exchange, which occurred a few days after the employer's HR representative interviewed claimant about the matter, claimant stated to his supervisor, "I just wanted to

[2] While the record does not explicitly show that the employer expected their employees to be truthful during investigations of potential wrongdoing, it can be reasonably inferred that they expected this.

see if you can tell them that you give [*sic*] me the okay to use the forklift because you knew we were coming in on Saturdays to pick up the pallets[.]" Claimant's supervisor responded, "I can't lie about it. Sorry, man." From this, the employer came to believe that claimant had not obtained permission from his supervisor, and on that basis determined that claimant had been untruthful during the investigation. However, at hearing, claimant testified that he *had* obtained permission from his supervisor, and explained that he had texted his supervisor with that request to "say remember you had given me permission and wanted him to tell the truth." Transcript at 16. In other words, claimant described his text message as merely an effort to get the supervisor to confirm to the employer that claimant had received permission from the supervisor to take the pallets on both occasions, not as a request for the supervisor to lie. Claimant's description of his text message is plausible. Because claimant's testimony as to whether he had obtained permission is a first-hand account, and the employer's evidence is hearsay, claimant's account is entitled to more weight where the parties' accounts conflict. As such, the record shows that claimant obtained permission to take the pallets, and does not show that claimant was untruthful during the employer's investigation.

Similarly, the employer's witness alleged that claimant violated their policy forbidding employees to operate forklifts alone. Transcript at 14. Claimant rebutted this allegation, explaining that he knew that he was not allowed to operate a forklift while alone, and that he was not alone but "with another person" when he took the pallets. Transcript at 16. Here as well, claimant's first-hand account is entitled to more weight than that of the employer's witness, which does not appear to be based on a first-hand account. Because claimant was not alone while he used the forklift, the record does not show that claimant violated the employer's policy by operating a forklift without another person present.

Finally, the employer alleged that claimant had failed to submit a material movement form for February 3, 2024. The record shows that claimant completed the form for that day, but that the security guard to whom he attempted to turn in the form told claimant that it was unnecessary. The employer did not rebut this assertion. Neither did the employer explain the procedure that they required employees to follow in completing or submitting the form. As such, it can be reasonably inferred from the evidence in the record that employees were supposed to turn the forms into a security guard on duty. Thus, claimant made a good-faith effort to comply with the employer's policy but was prevented from doing so because the security guard essentially refused to accept the form. Therefore, even if claimant's failure to turn in the form for February 3, 2024 violated the employer's policy, the record does not show that his failure to do so was either willful or wantonly negligent, as he did not act without regard for the consequences of his actions in failing to do so.

For the above reasons, the employer did not meet their burden to show that claimant was discharged for reasons that constituted willful or wantonly negligent violations of their standards of behavior. Claimant therefore was discharged, but not for misconduct, and is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on the work separation.

Dismissal of Request for Hearing on Decision # L0004422679. ORS 657.270(7)(a) provides that an administrative law judge may dismiss a request for hearing if:

> (A) The request for hearing is withdrawn by the requesting party;
>
> * * *

> (G) The request for hearing is made by a person who is not entitled to a hearing or is not the authorized representative of a party who is entitled to a hearing.

OAR 471-040-0035 (August 1, 2004) provides:

> (1) An administrative law judge may order that a request for hearing be dismissed upon request from the appellant to withdraw the request for hearing.
>
> * * *
>
> (3) On the administrative law judge's own initiative, an administrative law judge may order that a request for hearing be dismissed if:
>
> > * * *
> >
> > (e) The request for hearing is made by a person not entitled to a hearing on the merits or is made with respect to a determination or decision of the Director or authorized representative with respect to which there is no lawful authority to request a hearing.

Oregon courts follow the principle that a review on appeal may only be provided for justiciable controversies. *See, e.g., Gortmaker v. Seaton,* 252 Or. 440, 442, 450 P.2d 547 (1969). A justiciable controversy exists when the interests of the parties to the action conflict with each other, and the appeal will have some practical effect on the rights of the parties to the controversy. *Barcik v. Kubiacyk,* 321 Or 174, 895 P2d 765 (1995). To show a practical effect on their rights, an appellant must seek "substantive relief" through their appeal. *Krisor v. Henry,* 256 Or. App. 56, 300 P.3d 199 (Or. Ct. App. 2013).

On January 7, 2025, prior to the start of the hearing, the ALJ asked claimant if he intended to appeal a decision that was favorable to him. Audio Record at 3:00. Claimant responded, "no," which the ALJ interpreted to mean that claimant wished to withdraw his request for hearing on decision # L0004422679, and the ALJ dismissed claimant's request for hearing on that basis. Thus, to the extent that the ALJ correctly interpreted claimant's response as a request to withdraw the request for hearing on decision # L0004422679, the dismissal of claimant's request for hearing on that decision was authorized under ORS 657.176(7)(a)(A) and OAR 471-040-0035(1). However, even if the ALJ misconstrued claimant's response, and claimant did *not* intend to withdraw his request for hearing, the dismissal was still proper under ORS 657.176(7)(a)(G) and OAR 471-040-0035(3)(e).

Decision # L0004422679 determined that claimant's right to benefits based on wages earned prior to the separation addressed in decision # L0004347575 would not be cancelled, despite the employer's having reported that he was discharged for theft, because he did not admit to the theft and was not convicted of theft. Although the record was not developed on this point, it can be inferred from the record that the employer had reported to the Department, prior to the issuance of either administrative decision, that they believed that claimant's actions in taking the used pallets (as addressed in the Discharge section, above) constituted theft. Because of this, the Department was required under ORS 657.176(3) to determine whether claimant's right to benefits based on wages earned prior to the date of the separation should be cancelled.

In other words, the effect of such a cancellation would be that, even if claimant was able to end the disqualification caused by the work separation, he still would not be able to use any wages he had earned prior to April 3, 2024 as the basis for unemployment benefits. This analysis is separate from the question of whether claimant's work separation disqualified him from benefits, which was addressed in decision # L0004347575. Thus, because decision # L0004422679 determined that ORS 657.176(3) did not apply, it was favorable to claimant in that it did not negatively impact his eligibility for benefits, and an appeal of that decision would have had no practical effect on claimant's rights. Therefore, decision # L0004422679 presented no justiciable controversy, and claimant was not entitled to a hearing on the merits of that decision. Claimant's request for hearing on decision # L0004422679 was therefore properly dismissed, and that decision remains undisturbed.

DECISION: Order No. 25-UI-279960 is set aside, as outlined above. Order No. 25-UI-279062 is affirmed.

DECISIÓN: *Se revoca la Orden Judicial No. 25-UI-279960, como se explicó arriba. Se confirma la Orden Judicial No. 25-UI-279062.*

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

DATE of Service: February 27, 2025

FECHA de Notificación: 27 de febrero de 2025

NOTE: This decision reverses the ALJ's order denying claimant benefits. Please note that in most cases, payment of benefits owed will take about a week for the Department to complete.

NOTA: *Esta decisión revoca la orden judicial del juez que denegaba los beneficios al reclamante. Tenga en cuenta que en la mayoría de los casos, el pago de los beneficios adeudados tardará aproximadamente una semana en ser completado por el Departamento.*

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 stated above**. *See* ORS 657.282. For forms and information, visit https://www.courts.oregon.gov/courts/appellate/forms/Pages/appeal.aspx and choose the appropriate form under "File a Petition for Judicial Review." You may also contact the Court of Appeals by telephone at (503) 986-5555, by fax at (503) 986-5560, or by mail at 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97301.

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. If you are unable to complete the survey online and wish to have a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.

NOTA: *Puede apelar esta decisión presentando una Petición de Revisión Judicial ante la Corte de Apelaciones de Oregon (Oregon Court of Appeals)* ***dentro de los 30 días siguientes a la fecha de***

entrega de esta decisión indicada arriba. *Vea ORS 657.282. Para obtener formularios e información, visite* https://www.courts.oregon.gov/courts/appellate/forms/Pages/appeal.aspx *y elija el formulario para "Junta de Apelaciones Laborales". En este sitio web, hay información disponible en español. Puede solicitar un intérprete para la Corte en* https://web.courts.oregon.gov/osca/clas/CLASRequestFormRedirect.html *También puede comunicarse con la Corte de Apelaciones por teléfono al (503) 986-5555, por fax al (503) 986-5560 o por correo a 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97301.*

Por favor, ayúdenos a mejorar nuestro servicio completando una encuesta de servicio al cliente. *Para completar la encuesta en línea, vaya a* https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey. *Si no puede completar la encuesta en línea y desea obtener una copia impresa de la encuesta, comuníquese con nuestra oficina.*

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 – 本判决会影响您的失业救济金。 如果您不明白本判决， 请立即联系就业上诉委员会。 如果您不同意此判决，您可以按照该判决结尾所写的说明，向俄勒冈州上诉法院提出司法复审申请。

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 ໄດ້ ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄຳແນະນຳທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້.

Arabic

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فورا، 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 دستورالعمل 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
Email: *appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov*
Website: *www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx*