

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2025-EAB-0261

Affirmed
No Disqualification

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On January 23, 2025, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant quit working for the employer without good cause, disqualifying claimant from receiving benefits beginning November 10, 2024 (decision # L0008859330).¹ Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On March 20 and April 17, 2025, ALJ Griffith conducted a hearing, and on April 25, 2025 issued Order No. 25-UI-290655, reversing decision # L0008859330 by concluding that claimant quit work with good cause and was not disqualified from receiving benefits based on the quit. On April 29, 2025, the employer filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Beaverton School District employed claimant as a custodian from February 1 through November 16, 2024.

(2) On February 5, 2024, claimant sent an email to her supervisor stating that another custodian, S., “is harassing me, making rude comments.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 10.

(3) On February 21, 2024, claimant sent an email to her supervisor stating, “[S.] has repeatedly come to the school harassing me. . . I’ve already let numerous people know I called every time that he’s come. Sometimes I get no answer. I really would appreciate it if he did not come to this school anymore. He’s really starting to scare me. I’m here alone at nighttime. . . [so] it’s very scary for me. If I can have somebody work with me, that would be better. If not, maybe I can go to a different school where there’s other custodians at the same time that I’m here.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 11.

¹ Decision # L0008859330 stated that claimant was denied benefits from December 1, 2024 to November 29, 2025. However, because decision # L0008859330 found that claimant quit on November 13, 2024, it should have stated that claimant was disqualified from receiving benefits beginning Sunday, November 10, 2024, and until she earned four times her weekly benefit amount. See ORS 657.176.

(4) In March 2024, two supervisors told claimant in person that S. “would no longer be allowed to go to that school while [claimant was] working there.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 17.

(5) At the “end of” April 2024, S. came to the school where claimant worked and “slapped [her] in [her] behind.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 17-18. Claimant called her supervisor, who said that he “would call [S.] and make sure he leaves the school immediately,” and S. left. March 20, 2025 Transcript at 18.

(6) On July 9, 2024, claimant was working at the school, vacuuming, when S. appeared and “kind of overpowered [her], threw [her] on. . . one of the little kindergarten tables and tried to pull down [her] pants.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 18. Claimant called her supervisor and said, “I’m leaving the school right now. He’s back again, and he assaulted me this time. . . [Y]ou guys are not helping me, so I’m going to the sheriff’s.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 18. Claimant then went to the sheriff’s office and reported that she had been assaulted. The following day, claimant applied for and was granted a temporary protective order against S.

(7) Claimant did not perform work for the employer after July 9, 2024. At some point between July 10 and July 17, 2024, claimant filed a claim for Paid Leave Oregon benefits. Claimant sought mental health treatment regarding her experiences with S., and provided documentation from a doctor recommending a period of leave in connection with the claim. Claimant was approved for leave and benefits from July 10, 2024 through October 1, 2024.

(8) On July 31, 2024, claimant was granted a permanent protective order against S., who appeared at the hearing on that matter and “admitted to what he did.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 19.

(9) On October 1, 2024, claimant did not report for work following the end of Paid Leave Oregon benefits. The employer requested that claimant either return to work or provide documentation to request additional time off. The following day, claimant provided a note from her doctor that she should remain off work for three more weeks. On October 3, 2024, the employer advised claimant that the deadline to obtain approval from their third-party administrator for additional leave had been extended to October 28, 2024.

(10) On October 4, 2024, one of claimant’s coworkers reported to the employer that claimant had texted them that “S. tried to rape her.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 24. The employer’s executive administrator for human resources (“H. R. administrator”) called claimant that day to discuss the allegation.

(11) On October 7, 2024, the H. R. administrator received copies of the protective order and supporting documents in that case from claimant. The H. R. administrator believed that the information claimant had provided to the court and in their October 4, 2024 conversation differed substantially from the complaints she had contemporaneously made to the employer during her employment. The employer therefore conducted an investigation into these allegations, including conducting witness interviews. S. consistently denied having touched or harassed claimant, and the investigation found insufficient evidence to corroborate or disprove claimant’s allegations. The employer therefore declined to discharge S.

(12) On October 21, 2024, the employer’s third-party leave administrator denied claimant’s request for additional leave.

(13) On October 23, 2024, the employer sent claimant an email stating that they considered her to have been absent without leave since October 1, 2024, and that she needed to return to work or provide acceptable documentation to be granted further leave.

(14) On October 28, 2024, claimant provided a doctor's note to the employer excusing her from work for either two or three additional weeks.

(15) On October 30, 2024, the human resources representative spoke with claimant and told her that she must provide acceptable documentation from her doctor by November 13, 2024 to request additional leave, or return to work, or the employer would consider her to have resigned on that date. Claimant believed at the time that she had provided sufficient documentation and did not provide any further doctor's notes after October 28, 2024.

(16) On November 13, 2024, the employer sent claimant an email stating that they considered her to have resigned as of that day because she failed to return to work or provide documentation from her doctor to request additional leave. Claimant did not work for the employer thereafter.

(17) As of November 13, 2024, claimant wished to remain on leave until the employer could transfer her to a school where she would never be working alone. Claimant had conveyed to the H. R. administrator on several occasions, beginning in August 2024, that she was willing to return to work only if reassigned to a school where she would never be working alone, since she believed that S. would not respect the protective order. Claimant was told that no custodial positions were open at other schools, but that they would pursue a transfer when an opening occurred.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct.

Nature of the work separation. If an employee could have continued to work for the same employer for an additional period of time, the work separation is a voluntary leaving. OAR 471-030-0038(2)(a) (September 22, 2020). If the employee is willing to continue to work for the same employer for an additional period of time but is not allowed to do so by the employer, the separation is a discharge. OAR 471-030-0038(2)(b).

In their November 13, 2024 email to claimant notifying her of the work separation, the employer characterized the separation as a resignation due to job abandonment. However, the record shows that claimant was willing to continue the employment relationship on and after November 13, 2024 by remaining on leave until the employer met conditions she felt were necessary to ensure her safety at work. The employer was unwilling or unable to meet these conditions, and expected claimant to either return to work or present satisfactory documentation of her need for additional leave. When claimant failed to return to work or provide additional documentation by November 13, 2024, the employer became unwilling to continue the employment relationship. Accordingly, the work separation was a discharge that occurred on November 13, 2024.

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). “[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). A conscious decision not to comply with an unreasonable employer policy is not misconduct. OAR 471-030-0038(1)(d)(C).

The employer discharged claimant on November 13, 2024 because she would not return to work or provide additional documentation from her doctor to support a request for leave. The employer advised claimant in writing on October 28, 2024 that they expected her to either return to work or provide the documentation by that date, and that a work separation would occur if she did not do so. Claimant declined to report for work on November 13, 2024 out of concerns for her safety, and to the extent she provided doctor’s notes to the employer, understood that they did not meet the employer’s requirements to grant her leave beyond November 13, 2024. The misconduct analysis therefore first turns on whether the employer’s expectations were reasonable under the circumstances.

Claimant and the employer gave sharply contrasting accounts of the events leading to the work separation, as follows.

Employer’s testimony. The employer’s H. R. administrator was their only witness at hearing. He testified that according to personnel and payroll records, the “hire request” for claimant’s position was submitted on February 1, 2024, and claimant began work on February 23, 2024.² April 17, 2025 Transcript at 17. Claimant made no complaints to human resources, or that were otherwise documented in the employer’s records, until June 2024. On June 6, 2024, claimant requested a change to dayshift. When the H.R. administrator asked why, claimant stated that she felt “uncomfortable” working around S., and, while she denied that S. had threatened her, made “sexual comments” to or about her, or had engaged in “physical actions” toward her, she had “heard comments” about S. “sexually abusing other people” that made her feel uncomfortable working with him. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 18, 21. The H.R. administrator denied the request. On June 10, 2024, claimant submitted a written complaint to her supervisor against S., asserting that he had “tapped her on her butt one day while she was vacuuming.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 21.

Immediately following the written complaint, S. was directed not to enter the school where claimant worked and not to interact with her. In mid-July 2024, claimant filed a claim for Paid Leave Oregon benefits that was forwarded to the H. R. administrator because it contained allegations of sexual harassment against S. On July 17, 2024, the H. R. administrator spoke with claimant, who said there were “incidents in which [S.] . . . called her sexy, brought her lunch. . . [and] grabbed and squeezed her

² Claimant’s start date is significant because claimant alleged that S. harassed her on February 5, 2024 and February 15, 2024, and during the hearing she purported to read from emails she sent on those dates reporting S.’s conduct, which she also alleged were acknowledged by her supervisor in writing. See March 20, 2025 Transcript at 10-14. The employer suggested that because, according to their records, claimant did not start working for them until February 23, 2024, this testimony undermined her credibility as to the allegations against S., and generally. See April 17, 2025 Transcript at 14.

butts.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 22. The employer approved a leave of absence for claimant in connection with her Paid Leave Oregon claim from July 10 through August 5, 2024, which was later extended through October 1, 2024 after an additional doctor’s note was provided on August 26, 2024. In investigating the July 9, 2024 incident that precipitated the Paid Leave Oregon claim and claimant’s application for a protective order, the H. R. administrator determined that S. was directed by his supervisor to drive to the parking lot of the school where claimant was working to receive a delivery, and that while S. did not enter the building, claimant saw him in the parking lot while she was working in the building.

On September 5, 2024, the H.R. administrator called claimant to ask “what would it take for her to return” to work, and claimant replied that she “would not return unless [S.] is fired, or she. . . received a different position in the district, and she was requesting a paraeducator position.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 27. The employer was unwilling to discharge S. because “[t]here was no evidence to substantiate the reports that were being made,” and the employer was unwilling to employ claimant in “other than her custodial role.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 27-28. Claimant “repeatedly” stated after July 9, 2024 that she would not return to work unless S. was discharged, whenever the H. R. administrator contacted her to develop a “safety plan” for her return. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 28.

On October 3, 2024, the H. R. administrator spoke with claimant after she failed to return to work on October 1, 2024 following the end of her leave period. The H. R. administrator advised claimant that she needed to return to work or submit documentation from her doctor sufficient to be granted additional leave by their third-party administrator by October 28, 2024. Claimant told him that she had applied for the additional leave with the third-party administrator. On October 21, 2024, the third-party administrator denied claimant’s request for leave because no medical provider documentation was given. According to the employer’s records, claimant had not submitted medical documentation substantiating a need for leave since August 26, 2024, and on October 25, 2024 claimant forwarded an email from the Department to the H. R. administrator, but it was “an automatic reply stating that they’d received a communication from her,” apparently related to her exhausted Paid Leave Oregon claim and containing no new information from claimant’s doctor.

On October 4, 2024, the H. R. administrator became aware of a text message claimant had sent to a coworker that day alleging that S. had “tried to rape her.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 24. When the H. R. administrator spoke with claimant about this, she stated, “[H]e didn’t try to rape me. I wouldn’t let him.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 24. However, claimant explained to the administrator that S. “put his hands on her genital area and threw her into a room, and that occurred in February.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 24. On October 7, 2024, claimant sent a copy of the July 31, 2024 protective order and documents supporting her application for it to the H. R. administrator. The H. R. administrator read that claimant alleged in the protective order application only that S. “grabs my buttocks” as her justification for seeking the order. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 26-27. The H. R. administrator conducted “due process interviews” with witnesses, including S. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 26. S. “continually denied the allegations, from the initial tapping of the butt, to grabbing, to the rape allegations,” and the employer concluded that there was “no supporting evidence to [corroborate the statements] one way or the other.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 26. Following the investigation and a consultation with the employer’s legal counsel, the employer did not believe claimant’s allegations against S. due to inconsistencies in her reports. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 28-29. Nonetheless, the employer intended to

leave in place the directive that S. not contact or go near claimant, which was largely duplicative of the protective order.

Claimant did not submit additional documentation from her doctor by October 28, 2024, or return to work on that date. On October 30, 2024, the H. R. administrator spoke with claimant again, who stated that she was still undergoing treatment and wanted an additional opportunity to request leave. The H. R. administrator told claimant that she had until November 13, 2024, but if they did not receive acceptable documentation by that date, or claimant had not returned to work, they “would move forward with the resignation.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 31. Claimant did not respond thereafter or offer further documentation, and on November 13, 2024 the H. R. administrator sent claimant an email ending her employment.

Claimant’s testimony. In contrast to the H. R. administrator’s testimony, claimant testified that she attended orientation on January 31, 2024, which she specifically recalled because it was her birthday, and began working for the employer the next day, February 1, 2024. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 35. On February 5, 2024, claimant sent an email to her supervisor stating that S. “is harassing me, making rude comments.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 10. On February 21, 2024, claimant sent an email to her supervisor stating, “[S.] has repeatedly come to the school harassing me. . . I’ve already let numerous people know I called every time that he’s come. Sometimes I get no answer. I really would appreciate it if he did not come to this school anymore. He’s really starting to scare me. I’m here alone at nighttime. . . [so] it’s very scary for me. If I can have somebody work with me, that would be better. If not, maybe I can go to a different school where there’s other custodians at the same time that I’m here.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 11. The supervisor responded by sending her blank incident reports, which she filled out and returned by email and sent a hardcopy through the employer’s internal mail system. Two supervisors came to the school in response, which claimant believed occurred in March 2024, and told claimant that S. would no longer be allowed to go to the school where claimant worked.

Claimant further testified that at the “end of” April 2024, S. “[c]ame back around. . . and harassed me again. That’s when he actually slapped me in my behind, and I called immediately from my work phone. I called my supervisor. . . He said that he. . . would call [S.] and make sure he leaves the school immediately. . . and he did leave.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 18. “And then again, [on July 9, 2024], he came back again, and I was vacuuming and I had like this big backpack on. So like, he kind of like overpowered me, threw me on. . . one of the little kindergarten tables and tried to pull down my pants. Then I took the backpack off and I immediately went to the sheriff’s after that.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 18. Claimant called her supervisor and said, “I’m leaving the school right now. He’s back again, and he assaulted me this time, and. . . you guys are not helping me, so I’m going to the sheriff’s, and I went straight to the sheriff’s office.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 18. Claimant went to court “the next day to get a temporary restraining order on him,” and on July 31, 2024, “got a permanent one because he admitted to what he did.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 19.

Following the July 9, 2024 incident, claimant sought mental health treatment from various providers. Between the time the temporary and permanent protective orders were issued on July 10, 2024 and July 31, 2024, she applied for and was granted benefits from Paid Leave Oregon. The employer approved leave for the benefit period of July 10 through October 1, 2024. Claimant received a call from the H. R. administrator on September 30 or October 1, 2024, asking why she had not returned to work, and claimant said she believed that she had “maybe five days still on [her] doctor’s note.” March 20, 2025

Transcript at 31-32. Claimant stated that she was “still scared to go back to work” and requested to be transferred to a school where she would not have to work alone. March 20, 2025 Transcript at 33. Claimant testified that the H. R. administrator replied that he would “try his best to do what he can to get me moved. But for now, I needed to. . . get into the school. His words were, ‘[T]he school doesn’t clean itself.’” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 33. Claimant had also said this to the H. R. administrator in August 2024. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 6.

Claimant testified that on October 2, 2024, she provided a doctor’s note to the employer that said, “I needed a couple more weeks off, that’s all it said.” March 20, 2025 Transcript at 23. On October 21, 2024, the employer’s third-party leave administrator notified claimant that her request for additional leave had been denied, and on October 23, 2024 she received notification by email that if she did not provide acceptable documentation or return to work, they would consider her to have abandoned her job. April 17, 2025 Transcript at 7-8. On October 28, 2024, claimant emailed another doctor’s note to the H. R. administrator, excusing her for “[t]wo weeks through three weeks.”³ April 17, 2025 Transcript at 11. Claimant did not receive a written response until November 13, 2024, when she received an email stating that the employer considered her to have resigned due to her failure to return to work or provide documentation supporting a need for additional leave. Claimant testified that at some point between October 23, 2024 and November 13, 2024, she had called the H. R. administrator to state that she had no intention of resigning and had sent an updated doctor’s note, and during the call said, “I asked you guys to please put me somewhere where I could be safe to where the sex offender’s not working.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 13.

Analysis. In evaluating this conflicting evidence, claimant’s first-hand account is entitled to greater weight than contrary hearsay accounts, such as what S. or her supervisors said to the H. R. administrator, or what was reflected in the employer’s records or implied by the absence of records. Further, where claimant’s account conflicted with the H. R. administrator’s first-hand account, the evidence is no more than equally balanced, and as the employer bears the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence, that burden was not met. The facts have therefore been found in accordance with claimant’s account where it conflicts with other evidence.

The weight of the evidence therefore shows that claimant experienced increasingly serious acts of harassment from S. beginning in February 2024, and that claimant made timely reports to her supervisors of this conduct that they acknowledged. After claimant was advised by her supervisors in March 2024 that S. had been directed not to come to the school where she worked or to contact her, S. came to the school in late April 2024 and grabbed her buttocks, which was also timely reported to her supervisor. Despite this violation of the employer’s directive, no additional action was taken against S. On July 9, 2024, S. again came to claimant’s school, threw her on a table, and attempted to remove her pants in an incident claimant characterized as attempted rape. Claimant was granted leave and received mental health treatment from July 10, 2024 through October 1, 2024, and obtained a permanent order of protection against S. on July 31, 2024.

By October 2024, the employer had investigated claimant’s complaints and did not believe them, due to what the employer viewed as significant inconsistencies in claimant’s reports over time, or failure to

³ Claimant testified, “So it was three weeks because the first one was two weeks and then it went to three weeks, I believe.” April 17, 2025 Transcript at 11. However, it is unclear what claimant meant by this.

make contemporaneous reports, and a lack of corroborating evidence. The employer believed that their directive to S. to stay away from claimant, now backed by the threat of criminal punishment for violation due to the protective order, provided claimant with sufficient security that she should return to work. Given that S. had violated the directive twice before in increasingly dangerous ways, claimant felt that this “safety plan” was insufficient, and she repeatedly conditioned her return to work on a transfer to a school where other employees would be present to deter S. from attempting to contact her, or to protect her if he did. While the employer agreed to pursue transferring claimant when a position became available, in the meantime they required her to provide doctor’s notes indefinitely excusing her from work. Claimant provided a note excusing her for three weeks on October 2, 2024, and for either two or three additional weeks on October 28, 2024. The employer either failed to receive the notes or found them unacceptable for unexplained reasons. These circumstances culminated in the employer’s expectation that claimant either provide an additional, acceptable note excusing her from work, or return to work, by November 13, 2024. Claimant did not return to work or provide another note by that date.

Under these circumstances, claimant reasonably feared for her safety if she returned to work under the same conditions that allowed S. to contact her after being directed not to do so. The employer’s expectation that claimant either return to work under those conditions, or continually provide doctors notes until a position became available to which she could transfer, did not involve a standard of behavior that an employer has the right to expect of an employee. Accordingly, claimant’s conscious failure to comply with the employer’s unreasonable expectations did not constitute misconduct under OAR 471-030-0038(1)(d)(C).

For these reasons, claimant was discharged, but not for misconduct, and is not disqualified from receiving benefits based on the work separation.

DECISION: Order No. 25-UI-290655 is affirmed.

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

DATE of Service: June 5, 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 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 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.