EO: Intrastate
BYE: 26-Jul-2025

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

469
DS 005.00

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2025-EAB-0167

Reversed & Remanded

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On September 6, 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 July 7, 2024 (decision # L0005941837).[1] Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On February 26, 2025, ALJ Murray conducted a hearing, and on March 4, 2025, issued Order No. 25-UI-284835, reversing decision # L0005941837 by concluding that claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct, and therefore was not disqualified from receiving benefits based on the work separation. On March 13, 2025, the employer filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: EAB considered the employer's argument in reaching this decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) MC-KO LLC employed claimant as a deli lead in their grocery store from July 7, 2022 until July 6, 2024. As a deli lead, claimant's duties included, but may not have been limited to, ordering and stocking deli items, working the store's candy department, and stocking shelves in the grocery section of the store.

(2) The employer had a workplace conduct policy that, among other things, prohibited employees from "[f]ail[ing] to responsively carry out an order from a supervisor." Exhibit 1 at 45. The workplace conduct policy was contained in the employer's employee handbook. Claimant received the handbook and was aware of the policy.

(3) The employer believed that in February 2024, claimant had an argument with two coworkers "about who's supposed to do what in the warehouse and where to put things[.]" Transcript at 10.

[1] Decision # L0005941837 stated that claimant was denied benefits from July 28, 2024, to July 26, 2025. However, as decision # L0005941837 asserted that the work separation occurred on July 8, 2024, the administrative decision should have stated that claimant was disqualified from receiving benefits beginning Sunday, July 7, 2024, and until she earned four times her weekly benefit amount. *See* ORS 657.176.

(4) The employer believed that on March 23, 2024, claimant called the employer's grocery manager a "cocky idiot." Transcript at 10. The employer believed that the grocery manager stated that he could not work in that environment and asked to leave the store.

(5) The employer believed that on April 9, 2024, claimant refused to do job tasks relating to the store's candy department.

(6) The employer believed that on May 1, 2024, claimant had an argument with a coworker, and thereafter gossiped about the coworker to other coworkers in an effort to try "to get them mad at" the coworker with whom she had had the argument. Transcript at 11.

(7) The employer believed that on May 10, 2024, the employer counseled claimant about the performance of the deli department and that, during the meeting, claimant stated, "I don't care about numbers." Transcript at 12.

(8) The employer believed that on May 17, 2024, claimant refused a call to the store's warehouse and was shopping with her boyfriend while still on the clock.

(9) On July 6, 2024, the employer believed that claimant refused to be a backup cashier and refused to assist customers seeking to redeem recyclable bottles and cans for their refund value. Transcript at 5-6. The employer believed that claimant was insubordinate that day by engaging in "mouthy talk" with the employer's owner, which involved the owner asking claimant "to do certain things" but with claimant "multiple times" responding "that she's not doing this, that she can't do that, [and] that she's gotta do this[.]" Transcript at 6.

(10) On July 6, 2024, after claimant returned home from her shift, the employer called claimant and informed her by telephone that her employment was being terminated. On July 8, 2024, claimant came to the store and received from the employer a written severance notice and her final paycheck. The employer told claimant to read the severance notice and did not speak with claimant about the discharge while she was in the store.

(11) The severance notice listed numerous reasons for the discharge, such as "Negative Work Atmosphere" and "Disrespectful and Insubordinate Behavior," with a brief explanation lacking in concrete details listed under each reason. Exhibit 1 at 4-5. "Unprofessional Conduct on Saturday, July 6, 2024" was the final reason for the discharge listed on the notice. Exhibit 1 at 5. The notice stated that on that date claimant "did not get backups, respond to calls, or handle code 7s." Exhibit 1 at 5. The employer regarded the final incident leading to the discharge to be claimant's alleged refusal to assist customers with recyclables and her alleged refusal to be a backup cashier, as well as her alleged insubordination, on July 6, 2024.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 25-UI-284835 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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).

Isolated instances of poor judgment are not misconduct. OAR 471-030-0038(3)(b). The following standards apply to determine whether an "isolated instance of poor judgment" occurred:

> (A) The act must be isolated. The exercise of poor judgment must be a single or infrequent occurrence rather than a repeated act or pattern of other willful or wantonly negligent behavior.
>
> (B) The act must involve judgment. A judgment is an evaluation resulting from discernment and comparison. Every conscious decision to take an action (to act or not to act) in the context of an employment relationship is a judgment for purposes of OAR 471-030-0038(3).
>
> (C) The act must involve poor judgment. A decision to willfully violate an employer's reasonable standard of behavior is poor judgment. A conscious decision to take action that results in a wantonly negligent violation of an employer's reasonable standard of behavior is poor judgment. A conscious decision not to comply with an unreasonable employer policy is not misconduct.
>
> (D) Acts that violate the law, acts that are tantamount to unlawful conduct, acts that create irreparable breaches of trust in the employment relationship or otherwise make a continued employment relationship impossible exceed mere poor judgment and do not fall within the exculpatory provisions of OAR 471-030-0038(3).

OAR 471-030-0038(1)(d).

The order under review concluded that the employer discharged claimant, but not for misconduct. Order No. 25-UI-284835 at 3-4. The order reasoned that the employer had not met their burden to prove misconduct because the evidence offered by the employer and by claimant regarding whether claimant was discharged for misconduct was equally balanced. Order No. 25-UI-284835 at 3. Further development of the record is necessary to determine whether claimant's discharge was for misconduct.

Two points need to be addressed as an initial matter. First, the final incident was claimant's alleged refusal to do bottle counts and be a backup cashier, as well as her alleged insubordination, on July 6, 2024. This is so because, at hearing, the employer's witness cited those alleged violations as constituting the final incident. Transcript at 5-6. In addition, "Unprofessional Conduct on Saturday, July 6, 2024" was listed on claimant's severance notice, was the only reason cited that the notice supported with concrete details, and was the reason among those cited in the notice that happened most recent in time to

the discharge. Exhibit 1 at 5. Therefore, the proximate cause of the discharge was claimant's alleged violations on July 6, 2024, and those are the focus of the analysis. *See e.g. Appeals Board Decision* 12-AB-0434, March 16, 2012 (discharge analysis focuses on proximate cause of the discharge, which is generally the last incident of misconduct before the discharge); *Appeals Board Decision* 09-AB-1767, June 29, 2009 (discharge analysis focuses on proximate cause of discharge, which is the incident without which the discharge would not have occurred when it did). Second, the date of claimant's discharge was July 6, 2024, the date the employer called claimant after her shift and advised that her employment was terminated. While claimant went to the workplace to receive her final paycheck and the severance notice on July 8, 2024, the employer's oral advisement over the phone that claimant was discharged on July 6, 2024, severed the employment relationship.[2]

At hearing, the owner of the employer testified on behalf of the employer. The owner's son, who was the store manager, was present but was not allowed to testify. The employer also submitted unsworn statements from the owner's son, wife, and daughter-in-law, which were admitted into the hearing record. Exhibit 1 at 7-9. Claimant testified on her own behalf.

As to the final incident, the owner testified that, on July 6, 2024, claimant refused to do "bottle counts," *i.e.*, assist customers seeking to redeem recyclable bottles and cans for their refund value. Transcript at 5-6. The owner testified that claimant also refused to be a backup cashier that day and had been insubordinate toward the owner. Transcript at 6. The owner described the alleged insubordination in non-specific terms as "mouthy talk" involving him asking claimant "to do certain things" but with claimant "multiple times" responding "that she's not doing this, that she can't do that, that she's gotta do this[.]" Transcript at 6. The owner asserted that doing bottle counts and cashier work was "[r]outine daily for everybody." Transcript at 7. The unsworn statements submitted by the employer did not address the final incident. Exhibit 1 at 7-9.

For her part, claimant testified that her job duties consisted of ordering and stocking deli items and that she also sometimes worked in the candy department and stocked shelves in the grocery section. Transcript at 22, 28. Claimant explicitly denied that backup cashiering was one of her job duties, and implied that she was not required to perform bottle counts for customers, though she was not specifically asked about that at hearing. Transcript at 29. When asked generally how she recalled the events of July 6, 2024, claimant offered testimony suggesting that she was not asked to do the bottle counts or backup cashiering that day and had not been insubordinate. Specifically, claimant testified that the reference in the severance notice to her being unprofessional on July 6, 2024, was incorrect, that "[t]here wasn't an event" that day, and that she simply worked that day and after she went home received a call advising that she was being discharged. Transcript at 24.

Thus, whether on July 6, 2024, claimant committed the acts alleged by the employer was disputed by the parties, and the evidence presented by the parties on that subject was equally balanced. The hearing record would have benefited from the testimony of an additional witness who might corroborate one of the accounts and potentially tip the balance of the evidence in favor of one of the parties. The store manager was present during the hearing and available to testify but was not allowed to do so by the ALJ. Audio Record at 00:57 to 1:57, 2:24 to 2:42; Transcript at 20. It is not known for certain whether the

[2] That the discharge occurred on July 6, 2024, rather than July 8, 2024, is material because if, following remand, a determination is made that claimant was discharged for misconduct, the July 6, 2024, discharge date would result in a disqualification from benefits effective June 30, 2024.

manager could offer testimony about the events of July 6, 2024, based on personal knowledge of what occurred. However, at hearing, the owner described the manager as prepared to testify to "reinforce what [the owner] already said" and that the testimony would "cut into the same topics[.]" Transcript at 20. It thus appears that the manager may be able to offer testimony about the July 6, 2024, final incident.

Remand is necessary to develop the record on the final incident. On remand, the ALJ should seek additional details regarding the owner's assertion that claimant had refused to do backup cashiering and bottle count on July 6, 2024, by inquiring precisely when claimant made the refusals, how the owner became aware that claimant refused to do those tasks (such as whether the owner himself called claimant to do the tasks), and what explanation claimant gave to the employer, if any, for refusing to do the tasks. The ALJ should also question the owner about any additional instances of alleged insubordination committed by claimant that day. The ALJ should inquire precisely what the "certain things" were that the owner asked claimant to do on July 6, 2024, asking him to specify whether those things differed from the backup cashiering and bottle count tasks. The ALJ should ask the owner to describe claimant's tone of voice and words used when she engaged in the alleged "mouthy talk." The ALJ should also ask questions to develop the context of claimant's response of "she can't do that, . . . she's gotta do this," such as whether claimant was asserting that some other job duty took precedence and if so, what.

As to claimant's account of the final incident, the ALJ should ask her why she believed that doing bottle counts and backup cashiering were not part of her job, whether they ever had been part of her job previously, whether the owner's assertion that doing bottle counts and cashier work was "[r]outine daily for everybody" was accurate, and whether she believed the employer could alter her job duties at their discretion, such as by adding these tasks . The ALJ should also specifically ask claimant whether the employer requested that she do bottle counts and backup cashiering on July 6, 2024, and if so, whether she refused to do the tasks. If claimant was asked and refused, the ALJ should inquire why claimant declined to do the tasks, whether she believed she had the authority to refuse to do the tasks when requested to do them, and if so, what that belief was based upon. The ALJ should ask claimant about any additional acts of alleged insubordination on July 6, 2024. In particular, the ALJ should inquire whether the owner asked her to do "certain things" on July 6, 2024, whether those things differed from the bottle count and backup cashiering, and whether claimant refused to do those things, and, if so, why. The ALJ should further ask claimant whether she addressed the owner in a rude or insubordinate tone on July 6, 2024.

Once the accounts of the owner and claimant regarding the final incident have been further developed, the ALJ should assess whether any other witnesses present, such as the store manager, can offer testimony about the July 6, 2024, final incident to help resolve any remaining disputed issue. For example, if the record on remand remains equally balanced as to whether claimant was asked to do bottle count, backup cashiering, and was insubordinate on July 6, 2024, the manager is likely only to be able to help resolve the equal balance of the evidence if he can substantiate the owner's account from his own personal knowledge or observations. If, on the other hand, the manager can testify that claimant refused to do the bottle count and cashiering, and that testimony is based on something the manager heard but did not personally observe, the manager's testimony is unlikely to be helpful in tipping the balance of the evidence regarding the final incident. On remand, the ALJ should similarly assess any other witness who might be proffered by either party and evaluate whether any such witness could help resolve the equal balance of the evidence by testifying about the July 6, 2024, final incident from

personal knowledge. The ALJ should give due regard for any witness's relationship to the owner or claimant when weighing the evidence.

After developing the record sufficiently on the final incident, further development of the record regarding prior incidents will also be necessary if the record shows that claimant violated the employer's expectations willfully or with wanton negligence on July 6, 2024. This is necessary to assess whether that violation was an isolated instance of poor judgment.

Accordingly, on remand, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop the record regarding an alleged incident from February 2024. Per the owner's testimony, in February 2024, claimant allegedly had an argument with two coworkers "about who's supposed to do what in the warehouse and where to put things[.]" Transcript at 10. The owner testified that the incident resulted in a 30-minute counseling session. Transcript at 10; *see also* Exhibit 1 at 6. Claimant testified generally that she did not recall being counseled or having incidents with her coworkers. Transcript at 25, 29, 30. On remand, the ALJ should specifically ask claimant if she had an argument with two coworkers regarding the warehouse. If the record on remand shows that this argument occurred, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop whether claimant's conduct violated a known workplace expectation. As the owner testified that the store manager conducted a counseling session with claimant on an occasion, the ALJ may wish to question the manager about whether he counseled claimant regarding the incident that allegedly occurred in February 2024. Transcript at 20.

Next, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop the record regarding an alleged incident from March 23, 2024. Per the owner's testimony, on that date, claimant called a grocery manager a "cocky idiot," which resulted in the grocery manager not wanting to work with claimant and asking for permission to leave the store. Transcript at 9-10, 11; *see also* Exhibit 1 at 6. Claimant testified generally that she "never called people names." Transcript at 23. On remand, the ALJ should specifically ask claimant if she referred to the grocery manager as a "cocky idiot" in March 2024, and, if so, why she did so.

Next, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop the record regarding an alleged incident from March or April 2024 in which, per the owner's testimony, claimant "started refusing that she's not gonna do the candy[.]" Transcript at 11. The employer's documentary evidence suggests that the employer believed this incident to have occurred on April 9, 2024. *See* Exhibit 1 at 6. The ALJ should specifically ask claimant if she refused to do work tasks relating to candy on an occasion in March or April 2024, and, if so, why. If the record on remand shows that claimant refused to do tasks relating to candy, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop whether claimant's conduct violated a known workplace expectation.

Next, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop the record regarding an alleged incident from May 1, 2024. Per the owner's testimony, claimant displayed aggressive behavior toward a coworker on that date and then "broke the gossip policy, where then she ran to other people, and tried to get them mad at that one colleague that she had a fight with." Transcript at 11-12. Per the employer's documentary evidence, this resulted in a one-hour disciplinary conversation. *See* Exhibit 1 at 6. Claimant testified generally that she did not recall being counseled or having incidents with her coworkers. Transcript at 25, 29, 30. On remand, the ALJ should specifically ask claimant if she was aggressive toward a coworker on May 1, 2024, and, if so, why and whether that conduct violated a known workplace expectation. The ALJ should ask questions to develop whether claimant was made aware of a policy prohibiting gossip and, if so, whether she violated that policy on May 1, 2024. As the owner testified that the store manager

conducted a counseling session with claimant on an occasion, the ALJ may wish to question the manager about whether he counseled claimant regarding the incident that allegedly occurred on May 1, 2024. Transcript at 20.

Next, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop the record regarding an alleged incident from May 10, 2024. Per the owner's testimony, on that date, claimant was counseled about the performance of the deli department and stated "yeah, I don't care about numbers." Transcript at 12; *see also* Exhibit 1 at 6. Claimant testified generally that she did not recall receiving any counseling sessions. Transcript at 25. On remand, the ALJ should specifically ask claimant whether she was counseled about the deli department's performance on May 10, 2024, and, if so, what remarks, if any, she made during the meeting and whether claimant's alleged contribution to the deli department's poor performance or comments relating to same violated any known workplace expectations.

Next, the ALJ should make inquiries to develop the record regarding an alleged incident from May 17, 2024. Per the owner's testimony, on that date, claimant refused a call to the warehouse and was shopping with her boyfriend while on the clock. Transcript at 12-13; *see also* Exhibit 1 at 6. Claimant testified generally that she "never shopped on the clock." Transcript at 24. On remand, the ALJ should specifically ask claimant whether she refused a call to the warehouse on May 17, 2024, and whether, on that date, she shopped with her boyfriend while still on the clock and if she did so, why.

In developing the record regarding each of the prior incidents listed above, the ALJ should assess whether any other witnesses present can offer testimony based on their personal knowledge that may help resolve disputed issues or evidence that remains in equal balance. If, for example, the evidence on remand is equally balanced as to whether an alleged prior violation occurred, and a witness present can offer testimony based on personal knowledge or observations that can tip the balance of the evidence, the ALJ should consider taking testimony from that witness.

ORS 657.270 requires the ALJ to give all parties a reasonable opportunity for a fair hearing. That obligation necessarily requires the ALJ to ensure that the record developed at the hearing shows a full and fair inquiry into the facts necessary for consideration of all issues properly before the ALJ in a case. ORS 657.270(3); *see accord Dennis v. Employment Division,* 302 Or 160, 728 P2d 12 (1986). Because further development of the record is necessary for a determination of whether the employer discharged claimant for misconduct, Order No. 25-UI-284835 is reversed, and this matter is remanded.

DECISION: Order No. 25-UI-284835 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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

DATE of Service: <u>April 18, 2025</u>

NOTE: The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Order No. 25-UI-284835 or return this matter to EAB. Only a timely application for review of the subsequent order will cause this matter to return to EAB.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey. 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*