

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2025-EAB-0119-R

Request for Reconsideration Allowed
EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119 Modified on Reconsideration
Order No. 25-UI-282872 Modified
Request for Hearing Timely Filed
Base Year Wages Earned in Subject Employment
Decision # L0003567298 Claim Determination Correct

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On April 9, 2024, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of a Wage and Potential Benefit Report (WPBR) concluding that claimant had a monetarily valid claim for benefits with a base year consisting of the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2023, a weekly benefit amount of \$430, and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,180 (decision # L0003567298). Claimant filed a request for hearing. ALJ Kangas considered claimant's request, and on September 4, 2024, issued Order No. 24-UI-264844, dismissing claimant's request as late, subject to claimant's right to renew the request by responding to an appellant questionnaire by September 18, 2024. On September 16, 2024, claimant filed a timely response to the appellant questionnaire. On September 30, 2024, the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) mailed a letter stating that Order No. 24-UI-264844 was vacated and that a hearing would be scheduled to determine whether to allow claimant's request for hearing and, if so, the merits of decision # L0003567298. On January 28, 2025, ALJ Christon conducted a hearing, and on February 12, 2025, issued Order No. 25-UI-282872, allowing claimant's request for hearing as timely, and reversing decision # L0003567298 by concluding that claimant did not have a monetarily valid claim for benefits because his wages were not earned in subject employment. On February 19, 2025, claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 25-UI-282872 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

On March 25, 2025, EAB issued EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119, adopting the part of the order allowing claimant's request for hearing, and modifying the remainder of the order by concluding that claimant's base year wages were earned in subject employment and redetermining the claim to a monetarily valid claim with a base year of consisting of the fourth quarter of 2022 and the first, second, and third quarters of 2023, a weekly benefit amount of \$493, and a maximum benefit amount of \$12,818. On April 3, 2025, the Department filed a timely request for reconsideration of EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119. This decision is issued pursuant to EAB's authority under ORS 657.290(3).

EVIDENTIARY MATTER: For ease of reference in reviewing the “Jurisdiction to Address Wage Subjectivity” section below, EAB is providing EAB Exhibit 1 with this decision. As noted in EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119, EAB considered EAB Exhibit 1 as additional evidence under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119 advised the parties of their opportunity to object and no party did so. As such, EAB Exhibit 1 is part of the hearing record.

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant filed written arguments on February 19, 2025, and March 3, 2025. Both of claimant’s arguments contained information that was not part of the hearing record and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond his reasonable control prevented him from offering the information during the hearing. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019), and with the exception of EAB Exhibit 1, EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing. EAB considered any parts of claimant’s arguments that were based on the hearing record.

Additionally, the Department filed a written argument on February 26, 2025. The Department’s written argument contained information that was not part of the hearing record, and pertained to the question of whether claimant’s wages at issue in this matter were subject. As explained below, the ALJ lacked jurisdiction to rule on that matter, and the subjectivity of claimant’s wages therefore is not at issue here. As such, EAB did not consider the additional information in the Department’s written argument because it was not relevant and material to EAB’s determination of whether claimant’s claim should be redetermined. *See* ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090(1)(b)(A). EAB considered any parts of the Department’s argument that were based on the hearing record.

EAB considered the entire hearing record, including witness testimony and any exhibits admitted as evidence. EAB agrees with the part of Order No. 25-UI-282872 allowing claimant’s request for hearing on decision # L0003567298. That part of Order No. 25-UI-282872 is **adopted**. *See* ORS 657.275(2).

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On or around April 2, 2023, claimant filed an initial claim for benefits (“the prior benefit year”) with an effective date of April 2, 2023. That claim was based on a base year consisting of all four calendar quarters of 2022. On March 30, 2024, the claim expired and claimant’s prior benefit year terminated.

(2) On March 31, 2024, claimant filed an initial claim for benefits (“the current benefit year”). The Department determined that claimant had a monetarily valid claim for benefits, with a weekly benefit amount of \$430 and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,180. The Department made this determination based on a base year consisting of all four calendar quarters of 2023, with hours and wages from the employer reported as follows:

| Quarter | Wages | Hours |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1 st Quarter 2023 | \$22,232.00 | 398 |
| 2 nd Quarter 2023 | \$3,757.60 | 68 |
| 3 rd Quarter 2023 | \$1,456.00 | 26 |
| 4 th Quarter 2023 | \$7,022.40 | 126 |
| Total | \$34,468.00 | 618 |

Exhibit 7 at 12.

(3) On January 15, 2025, OAH served notice of the hearing in this matter, scheduled for January 28, 2025. The notice stated that the issues to be considered at hearing were:

Whether claimant's claim determination reflects all of the wages or hours worked in subject employment in the base year to which claimant is entitled. (ORS 657.150.) Was the request for hearing filed within the 10-day time limit; and, if not, is there good cause for extending the limit a reasonable time? (ORS 657.266(5), 657.875, OAR 471-040-0005 and 471-040-0010.)

EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. The notice of hearing also enclosed copies of the statutes and administrative rules relevant to the issues to be addressed at hearing. Regarding the claim determination issue, the following laws and rules were enclosed with the notice of hearing: ORS 657.150; ORS 657.170; OAR 471-030-0023; OAR 471-030-0100; ORS 657.266; OAR 471-030-0010; OAR 471-030-0021; and OAR 471-030-0048. EAB Exhibit 1 at 3–6. The notice of hearing did not indicate that the question of whether claimant's wages were earned in subject employment, per ORS 657.040 *et. seq.*, would be addressed at hearing, nor were copies of those statutes enclosed with the notice of hearing. Prior to the hearing, the ALJ did not identify the question of whether claimant's wages were earned in subject employment as an issue to be addressed at hearing, and the parties did not waive their right to notice of that issue being addressed at hearing. The issue was not addressed at hearing, and no testimony was taken on that issue.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: The Department's request for reconsideration is allowed and 2025-EAB-0119 is modified. The ALJ lacked jurisdiction to address the subjectivity of claimant's wages, and the Department's initial determination that claimant's base year wages were subject remains undisturbed. Claimant's base year consists of the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2023. Claimant has a weekly benefit amount of \$430 and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,180.

Request for 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 Department filed its request for reconsideration within 20 days after EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119 was mailed, and the request included a statement that a copy was provided to the other party. The Department filed the request to correct an error of fact or law, or to obtain an explanation for an unexplained inconsistency with the Department's rule, position, or practice. The Department's request for reconsideration is therefore allowed. EAB erred in failing to defer to the Department's interpretation of OAR 471-030-0005(2) (January 11, 2018). At hearing, the witness for the Department explained that claimant's March 31, 2024 initial claim filing date occurred in the second quarter of 2024 and resulted in a base year of all quarters of 2023. Transcript at 12. This view necessarily conveys that the Department interprets the excepting language of OAR 471-030-0005(2) to apply not expansively to the entire claim determination process but merely to the two specific subsections identified in the rule. While the

interpretation of OAR 471-030-0005(2) set forth in EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119 was reasonable, the Department's interpretation of the administrative rule is owed deference unless it is inconsistent with the rule's text, context, or any other source of law. *See accord Ring v. Employment Dep't.*, 205 Or App 532, 134 P3d 1096 (2006), *citing Don't Waste Oregon Com. v. Energy Facility Siting*, 320 Or 132, 142, 881 P2d 119 (1994); *Johnson v. Employment Dept.*, 189 Or App 243, 74 P3d 1159 (*Johnson II*), *adh'd to as modified on recons.*, 191 Or App 222, 81 P3d 730 (2003) (*Johnson III*). The Department's interpretation is not implausible. As discussed below, claimant's base year is all four calendar quarters of 2023. Claimant is entitled to a weekly benefit amount of \$430 and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,180. On reconsideration, EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119 is modified, as clarified herein.

Jurisdiction to Address Wage Subjectivity. The following "Jurisdiction to Address Wage Subjectivity" section was contained in EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119. That section was correct and is adhered to on reconsideration.

OAR 471-040-0015(1) (August 1, 2004) states, "To afford all parties a reasonable opportunity for a fair hearing, notice of hearing setting forth the time, date, place, and issue(s) in general shall be personally delivered or mailed at least five days in advance of the hearing to parties or their authorized agents at their last known address as shown by the record of the Director."

OAR 471-040-0025 (August 1, 2004) states, in relevant part:

(1) The purpose of the hearing is to inquire fully into the matters at issue and to make a decision on the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing.

* * *

(8) In any hearing, the administrative law judge shall render a decision on the issue and law involved as stated in the notice of hearing. The administrative law judge's jurisdiction and authority is confined solely to the issue(s) arising under the Employment Department Law. Subject to objection by any party, the administrative law judge may also hear and enter a decision on any issue not previously considered by the authorized representative of the Director and which arose during the hearing. The administrative law judge may continue the hearing or remand the matter to the authorized representative for consideration and action upon such issue(s) under the provisions of ORS 657.265. However, in no event shall the administrative law judge accept jurisdiction of a new issue and proceed with hearing on such issue when an interested party to such new issue has not waived right to notice.

The principal issue to be addressed at the hearing on the merits of decision # L0003567298, as explained on the notice of hearing, was the determination of "whether claimant's claim determination reflects all of the wages or hours worked in subject employment in the base year to which claimant is entitled." EAB Exhibit 1 at 1. At hearing, the ALJ did not propose to take jurisdiction over any additional issues, nor did the parties waive their right to notice on any additional issues. Therefore, the scope of the hearing on the merits of decision # L0003567298 was confined to the determinations of what claimant's base year should be, and what his benefit amounts should be, based on the wages reported for his base year. Nevertheless, the order under review concluded that "the larger issue in this case is whether claimant worked in subject employment during the base year at issue, as required under ORS

657.150(2)(a) for a valid claim[.]” Order No. 25-UI-282872 at 5. The order under review further concluded that claimant’s wages for the base year determined by decision # L0003567298 were not subject wages, explaining, in relevant part:

Claimant serves as the sole corporate officer and director of his corporation. As such, his role in his corporation was not subject employment as defined by ORS 657.044. Because his wages were not earned in subject employment, they cannot be used to support an unemployment insurance claim.

Order No. 25-UI-282872 at 5. Such a determination was outside the scope of the issues noticed for hearing, and the ALJ therefore lacked jurisdiction to rule on this issue under OAR 471-040-0025(8). To be clear, ORS 657.150(2) does require, as discussed further in the following section, a finding that the individual has met a threshold amount of subject wages and/or hours for their base year in order to form a monetarily valid claim for benefits. That finding must therefore be based upon the subject wages reported by the individual’s employer(s) for the base year. However, the determination of whether the wages are, themselves, “subject wages” (*i.e.*, wages that are subject to ORS Chapter 657, and which therefore can be used as the basis for a claim) is an entirely separate analysis. That analysis is governed by separate statutory provisions (ORS 657.040 *et. seq.*) and requires findings of fact not contemplated by ORS 657.150 or any of the other statutes or administrative rules included in the notice of hearing. Thus, because the issue of whether claimant’s wages during the base year were subject wages was not properly noticed, it was not an issue to be addressed at hearing, and ruling on that issue was improper. As such, EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119’s conclusion that claimant’s wages were subject is adhered to on reconsideration.¹

Claim Redetermination. ORS 657.010 states, in relevant part:

(1) “Base year” means the first four of the last five completed calendar quarters preceding the benefit year.

* * *

(3) “Benefit year” means a period of 52 consecutive weeks commencing with the first week with respect to which an individual files an initial valid claim for benefits, and thereafter the 52 consecutive weeks period beginning with the first week with respect to which the individual next files an initial valid claim after the termination of the individual’s last preceding benefit year except that the benefit year shall be 53 weeks if the filing of an initial valid claim would result in overlapping any quarter of the base year of a previously filed initial valid claim.

(4) “Calendar quarter” means the period of three consecutive calendar months ending on March 31, June 30, September 30 or December 31, or the approximate equivalent thereof, as the Director of the Employment Department may, by rule, prescribe.

* * *

¹ While the Department did not explicitly state, either at hearing or in decision # L0003567298, that claimant’s base year wages were subject, it can be inferred that the Department made such a determination, as the Department would not have found claimant to have a monetarily valid claim if his wages were not subject.

OAR 471-030-0005(2) states, “Except for purposes of computing total base year wages under ORS 657.150(2) and benefit entitlement under ORS 657.150(4), a week is within that calendar quarter which includes the greater part of the week.”

ORS 657.150 states, in relevant part:

(1) An individual shall be paid benefits for weeks during the benefit year in an amount that is to be determined by taking into account the individual’s work in subject employment in the base year as provided in this section.

(2)(a) To qualify for benefits an individual must have:

(A) Worked in subject employment in the base year with total base year wages of \$1,000 or more and have total base year wages equal to or in excess of one and one-half times the wages in the highest quarter of the base year; and

(B) Have earned wages in subject employment equal to six times the individual’s weekly benefit amount in employment for service performed subsequent to the beginning of a preceding benefit year if benefits were paid to the individual for any week in the preceding benefit year.

(b) If the individual does not meet the requirements of paragraph (a)(A) of this subsection, the individual may qualify for benefits if the individual has worked a minimum of 500 hours in employment subject to this chapter during the base year.

* * *

(4)(a) An eligible individual’s weekly benefit amount shall be 1.25 percent of the total wages paid in the individual’s base year. However, such amount shall not be less than the minimum, nor more than the maximum weekly benefit amount.

* * *

(d) All weekly benefit amounts, if not a multiple of \$1, shall be computed to the next lower multiple of \$1.

* * *

(5) Benefits paid to an eligible individual in a benefit year shall not exceed 26 times the individual’s weekly benefit amount, or one-third of the base year’s wages paid, whichever is the lesser. If such amount is not a multiple of \$1, it shall be computed to the next lower multiple of \$1.

The Department determined that claimant had a monetarily valid claim, with a base year of all four calendar quarters of 2023. That determination was correct. Under ORS 657.010(3), claimant’s benefit

year on the current claim began with the “first week” claimant next filed an initial valid claim after the termination of claimant’s prior benefit year. Claimant’s prior benefit year ended on March 30, 2024.

Claimant filed the initial claim for the current benefit year on March 31, 2024. Applying OAR 471-030-0005(2), a “week” is within the calendar quarter that includes the greater part of the week. This results in Sunday, March 31, 2024, being included along with April 1 through 6, 2024, as the first week of the second calendar quarter of 2024. That means the week of March 31, 2024 through April 6, 2024, which the Department regards as claim calendar week 14-24, was the first week claimant filed an initial valid claim after the end of his prior benefit year. Claimant’s current benefit year therefore began the week of March 31, 2024 through April 6, 2024, and the determination of which calendar quarters comprise claimant’s base year is dependent on whether that week is deemed to have occurred in the first or second calendar quarter of 2024.

Under ORS 657.010(1), claimant’s base year is comprised of the first four of the last five completed calendar quarters preceding his current benefit year, which began the week of March 31, 2024 through April 6, 2024. For reasons explained in greater detail below, that week is deemed by rule to have occurred in the second calendar quarter of 2024. The five completed calendar quarters preceding the current benefit year are the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2023, and the first quarter of 2024. The first four of these quarters are the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2023. Therefore, claimant’s base year is all four calendar quarters of 2023.

Claimant argued that when his current benefit year began on March 31, 2024, the first quarter of 2024 was not yet completed and so should not be considered one of the last five completed quarters preceding the current benefit year. February 19, 2025 Claimant’s Argument at 4, 26-33. March 31, 2024 was the last day of the third month of the year and thus, if viewing calendar quarters literally, could be perceived as the last day of the first quarter of 2024. This could lead one to conclude that the first quarter of 2024 was not a completed quarter as of when claimant’s current benefit year began on March 31, 2024. Under this view, the last five completed calendar quarters preceding the current benefit year would be the fourth quarter of 2022, and the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2023. This reading would produce a base year consisting of the fourth quarter of 2022, and the first, second, and third quarters of 2023.

However, the first quarter of 2024 is regarded as a completed calendar quarter that came before claimant’s benefit year. ORS 657.010(4) defines that calendar quarter as the “three consecutive calendar months ending on March 31, . . . or the approximate equivalent thereof, as the Director of the Employment Department may, by rule, prescribe.” Here, the Department’s prescribing rule is OAR 471-030-0005(2). That rule imposes an approximate equivalent end date for the first quarter of 2024 of March 30, 2024. This is so because, as discussed above, the application of OAR 471-030-0005(2) calls for March 31, 2024 to be included along with April 1 through 6, 2024, as the first week of the second calendar quarter of 2024.

OAR 471-030-0005(2) states that its directive that “a week is within that calendar quarter which includes the greater part of the week” does not apply “for computing total base year wages under ORS 657.150(2) and benefit entitlement under ORS 657.150(4).” Because of this excepting language, in EAB decision 2025-EAB-0119, EAB concluded that OAR 471-030-0005(2) did not apply. 2025-EAB-0119 at 6. However, the Department construes the excepting language of OAR 471-030-0005(2) expansively to

cover the entire claim determination process. At hearing, the witness for the Department explained that claimant's March 31, 2024 initial claim filing date occurred in the second quarter of 2024 and resulted in a base year of all quarters of 2023. Transcript at 12. This view necessarily conveys that the Department interprets the excepting language of OAR 471-030-0005(2) to apply not expansively to the entire claim determination process but merely to the two specific subsections identified in the rule. The Department's interpretation of the administrative rule is owed deference unless it is inconsistent with the rule's text, context, or any other source of law. *See accord Ring v. Employment Dep't.*, 205 Or App 532, 134 P3d 1096 (2006), *citing Don't Waste Oregon Com. v. Energy Facility Siting*, 320 Or 132, 142, 881 P2d 119 (1994); *Johnson v. Employment Dept.*, 189 Or App 243, 74 P3d 1159 (*Johnson II*), *adh'd to as modified on recons.*, 191 Or App 222, 81 P3d 730 (2003) (*Johnson III*). The Department's interpretation is not implausible and EAB defers to it here.

The excepting language of OAR 471-030-0005(2) applies only to the specific subsections identified in the rule and does not apply to ORS 657.010, which defines "Benefit year," "Base year," and "Calendar quarter." The claim determination process applies the concepts of "Benefit year," "Base year," and "Calendar quarter" to establish the base year of a claimant's claim. Doing so requires identifying the "first week" of the benefit year and working backwards to ascertain the five quarters that precede the benefit year, with the first four of these five quarters constituting the base year. OAR 471-030-0005(2) applies to this task.

Only after the base year is determined can the computational tasks set forth by ORS 657.150(2) and ORS 657.150(4) be performed. These tasks serve to calculate whether a claimant's total base year wages are sufficient to support a valid initial claim (ORS 657.150(2)), and, if so, to calculate the claim's weekly benefit amount by multiplying the total base year wages paid by 1.25% (ORS 657.150(4)). It is for these two specific purposes, rather than for the purpose of identifying which calendar quarters comprise the base year, that OAR 471-030-0005(2) exempts treatment of a week as falling within the quarter that contains the majority of the week. The exceptions in the rule appear intended to accommodate the fact that employers use true calendar quarters when making their quarterly reports to the Department, and so the Department assigns wages to calendar quarters based on the literal calendar quarters in which an individual is paid, irrespective of OAR 471-030-0005(2).

Thus, how the Department figures the wages it assigns to calendar quarters based on employer reports, *i.e.*, what constitutes the total wages in a base year used to compute monetary eligibility and weekly benefit amount, are based on true calendar quarters. However, when it comes to identifying which calendar quarters constitute the base year *itself*, that analysis, which includes a consideration of the first week of a benefit year and calendar quarter end dates, is governed by the "a week is within that calendar quarter which includes the greater part of the week" standard set forth by OAR 471-030-0005(2).

Accordingly, claimant's base year is all four calendar quarters of 2023. The sum of the wages for those quarters is \$34,468. The "highest quarter"—*i.e.*, the base-year quarter in which claimant earned the most—was the first quarter of 2023, in which claimant earned \$22,232.00. One and one-half times claimant's highest-quarter wages is \$33,348, which is less than claimant's total base year wages. Therefore, claimant's wages for these four quarters qualify him for a monetarily valid claim. 1.25 percent of his total base year wages is \$430.85, and claimant's weekly benefit amount, when rounded to the next lowest dollar amount, therefore is \$430. 26 times claimant's weekly benefit amount is \$11,180,

and 1/3 of claimant's total base year wages is \$11,489.33. As the former figure is the lesser of the two, claimant's maximum benefit amount is \$11,180.

For the above reasons, the claim determination reflected in the April 9, 2024, WPBR (decision # L0003567298) is correct. Claimant's base year is all four calendar quarters of 2023. Claimant is entitled to a weekly benefit amount of \$430 and a maximum benefit amount of \$11,180.

DECISION: The Department's request for reconsideration is allowed. On reconsideration, EAB Decision 2025-EAB-0119 is modified as outlined above. Order No. 25-UI-282872 is modified, as outlined above.

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

DATE of Service: April 30, 2025

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.



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 ໄດ້ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄໍາແນະນຳທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນຫ້າຍຂອງຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້.

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 الاستئناف 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

Email: appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov

Website: www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx

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.