

**EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION**  
**2025-EAB-0303**

*Affirmed*  
*Overpayment Waiver Granted*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On June 20, 2024, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision denying claimant's request to waive recovery of an overpayment balance of \$18,290, including \$17,492 in combined Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) and Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation (FPUC) benefits (decision # L0004637859).<sup>1</sup> Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On April 7, 2025, ALJ Monroe conducted a hearing, and on May 8, 2025, issued Order No. 25-UI-291719, reversing decision # L0004637859 by granting claimant's waiver request. On May 21, 2025, the Department filed a timely application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

**EVIDENTIARY MATTER:** EAB has considered additional evidence when reaching this decision under OAR 471-041-0090(1) (May 13, 2019). The additional evidence is the June 1, 2022, administrative decision assessing the overpayment at issue, which is contained in Employment Department Records. It has been marked as EAB Exhibit 1, and provided to the parties with this decision. Any party that objects to EAB taking notice of this information must send their objection to EAB in writing, saying why they object, within ten days of EAB mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless EAB receives and agrees with the objection, the exhibit will remain in the record.

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

<sup>1</sup> As explained in greater detail in footnote 2, the underlying administrative decision assessed the combined PUA and FPUC overpayment amount at \$17,492, though the Department may have intended to instead assess it at \$18,290. Claimant was nonetheless liable to repay only the \$17,492 assessed, exclusive of penalties or interest, and that is considered the outstanding balance for purposes of the waiver request.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) On December 6, 2020, claimant filed an initial claim for PUA benefits that the Department determined was monetarily valid. Claimant thereafter claimed benefits for the weeks of December 12, 2020, through September 4, 2021 (weeks 50-20 through 35-21). These are the weeks at issue. The Department paid claimant a combined total of \$18,290 in PUA and FPUC benefits for the weeks at issue.

(2) On April 8, 2021, the Department sent claimant a request for documentation to substantiate that she had been employed or self-employed prior to becoming unemployed for a COVID-19 related reason. Claimant submitted a copy of a business name registration related to the provision of pet care services that had been filed in February 2019 with the Secretary of State, bank statements, “taxes,” statements of electronic payments received from customers, and “a couple letters from [her] clients.” Transcript at 28, 36.

(3) Shortly after submitting these documents, the Department sent claimant an email stating, “Thank you for providing proof of self-employment. We . . . have reviewed your documentation and determined you have met this requirement.” Transcript at 27-28.

(4) More than one year later, in approximately May 2022, the Department re-reviewed this documentation and concluded that it did not sufficiently substantiate claimant’s entitlement to PUA benefits. An employee from the Department emailed claimant asking for additional documentation, stating, “If you choose to, please submit your 2019 IRS tax transcript or [profit and loss] statement within 5 business days of this email.” Exhibit 2 at 4. Claimant’s reply questioned the legitimacy of the email, in part because it requested her social security number, among other personal identifying information, it was arriving over a year after she had received verification from the Department she had provided documentation and met the requirements, and because she received the email when other scams were occurring. Claimant did not provide the requested documentation.

(5) On May 24, 2022, the Department issued an Amended Notice of Determination for PUA concluding that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits for the weeks at issue because “she failed to provide evidence as requested for self-employment.” Transcript at 10. Claimant filed a late request for hearing on the May 24, 2022, PUA determination, which was dismissed by the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) as late. As of the date of this decision, that dismissal order remains undisturbed.

(6) On June 1, 2022, the Department issued an administrative decision based, in part, on the May 24, 2022 PUA determination, concluding that claimant willfully made a misrepresentation and failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits, was overpaid \$17,492 in combined PUA and FPUC benefits that she was required to repay, and assessed a monetary penalty of \$5,247.60.<sup>2</sup> Claimant filed a late request for hearing on the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision, which was dismissed by OAH as late. As of the date of this decision, that dismissal order remains undisturbed.

---

<sup>2</sup> Despite citing claimant’s ineligibility for PUA benefits for the entire period that program existed, the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision’s schedule of adjustments inexplicably concluded that claimant was eligible for \$157 and \$41 in PUA benefits for the weeks of May 23, 2021, through May 29, 2021 (week 21-21) and May 30, 2021, through June 5, 2021 (week 22-21), respectively, as well as \$300 in FPUC benefits for each of those weeks. EAB Exhibit 1 at 5. Thus, the overpayment was assessed at \$17,492, rather than the \$18,290 total amount of PUA and FPUC benefits claimant was paid for the weeks at issue. (\$18,290 - \$157 - \$41 - \$300 - \$300 = \$17,492).

(7) The June 1, 2022, overpayment decision contained six “findings of fact” in support of its conclusion that claimant willfully made a misrepresentation and failed to report a material fact to obtain benefits, the first and sixth of which set forth the effective dates of the PUA claim, and the amount of benefits paid for the weeks at issue, respectively. EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. The second finding cited issuance of the May 24, 2022, PUA determination’s conclusion that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits, “as [she] failed to provide evidence as requested for self-employment.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. The third finding stated that claimant “was discharged from employer Sunset Auto Parts, Inc. for a non-covid reason.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. The fourth finding stated, “Proof of earnings provided were insufficient to establish PUA eligibility as set forth in UIPL 16-20[.]” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. The fifth finding stated, “Claimant is not licensed in the State of Oregon to perform this type of work.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2.

(8) On June 18, 2024, claimant filed a request to waive recovery of the outstanding balance of the overpayment. On June 20, 2024, the Department issued decision # L0004637859, denying the request and requiring claimant to pay the overpayment in the amount of \$18,290.<sup>3</sup>

(9) Claimant did not have earnings reported to the Department from the second quarter of 2023 through the first quarter of 2025.<sup>4</sup> As of June 18, 2024, claimant was not working, and supported three minor children. All members of claimant’s family received benefits from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Medicaid, based on the family income. In her waiver request, claimant reported monthly income that equaled her expenses.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant’s request to waive recovery of the overpayment is granted.

Waiver of PUA and FPUC overpayments are governed by the provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 9201(d)(4) and 15 U.S.C. § 9023(f)(2), respectively. For waiver to be granted, both provisions require: (1) that the overpayment of PUA and FPUC benefits be without fault on the part of the claimant, and (2) that repayment be contrary to equity and good conscience.

Federal guidance provides that, in general, “an individual is considered to be without fault when the individual provided all information correctly as requested by the state, but the state failed to take appropriate action with that information or took delayed action when determining eligibility.” Unemployment Insurance Program Letter (UIPL) 20-21, Change 1 at 9-10 (February 7, 2022). However, a “state may also find that an individual is without fault if the individual provided incorrect information due to conflicting, changing, or confusing information or instructions from the state . . . or other similar difficulties (*e.g.*, education, literacy, and/or language barriers) in understanding what information the state needed from the individual[.]” UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 10.

---

<sup>3</sup> The \$18,290 figure used in the waiver denial was likely an error given the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision was \$17,492 in combined PUA and FPUC benefits, as detailed in footnote 2.

<sup>4</sup> EAB has taken notice of this fact, which is contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1). Any party that objects to EAB taking notice of this information must send their objection to EAB in writing, stating why they object, within ten days of EAB mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless EAB receives and agrees with the objection, the noticed fact(s) will remain in the record.

With respect to the “contrary to equity and good conscience” element, federal guidance provides that states may defer to state law in defining what it means for repayment to be contrary to equity and good conscience, or may use the federal standard. UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 10. The federal standard provides that recovery is “contrary to equity and good conscience” when one of at least three circumstances are present. Those circumstances are: (1) recovery would cause financial hardship to the person from whom it is sought; (2) the recipient of the overpayment can show (regardless of their financial situation) that due to the notice that such payment would be made or because of the incorrect payment, either they have relinquished a valuable right or changed positions for the worse; or (3) recovery would be unconscionable under the circumstances. UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 10-13. The guidance elaborates that recovery would cause financial hardship where “review of the individual’s income to debts (including copies of pay records and bills) reflects the hardship caused by having to repay an overpayment because the individual needs much of their current income and liquid assets (including the CARES Act benefits received) to meet ordinary and necessary living expenses and liabilities.” UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 11.

UIPL No. 20-21 Change 1, Section 4.b provides, in relevant part:

**Fraudulent Overpayments.** When establishing an overpayment, the state must determine who is at fault for the overpayment (i.e., individual, employer, state, or a combination thereof) and whether the overpayment is the result of claimant fraud; not all overpayments are fraudulent. If an overpayment is the result of claimant fraud, states **may not** waive recovery activities for the overpayment. Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.b. of UIPL No. 20-21, the state must apply a minimum 15 percent monetary penalty to an overpayment when the state determines, in accordance with their state UC law, that such a payment was made due to fraud. States must apply the same monetary penalty to CARES Act UC programs as it does to the regular UC program.

\* \* \*

- A. Eligibility fraud occurs when benefits or services are acquired as a result of false information being provided with the intent to receive benefits for which an individual would not otherwise be eligible. State law determines the criteria for establishing a fraud determination within the UC programs. [citations omitted]

\* \* \*

- ii. ***Recovery of fraudulent overpayments.*** Under no circumstances may a state waive recovery activities for a fraudulent overpayment. \* \* \*

\* \* \*

(Emphasis in original).

ORS 657.215 provides, in relevant part, “An individual is disqualified for benefits for a period not to exceed 52 weeks whenever the Director of the Employment Department finds that the individual has

willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failed to report a material fact, to obtain any benefits under this chapter.”

ORS 657.310(1) provides that an individual who received benefits to which the individual was not entitled is liable to either repay the benefits or have the amount of the benefits deducted from any future benefits otherwise payable to the individual under ORS chapter 657. That provision applies if the benefits were received because the individual made or caused to be made a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, or failed to disclose a material fact, regardless of the individual’s knowledge or intent. ORS 657.310(1). In addition, an individual who has been disqualified for benefits under ORS 657.215 for making a willful misrepresentation is liable for a penalty in an amount of at least 15, but not greater than 30, percent of the amount of the overpayment. ORS 657.310(2).

ORS 657.317(2) provides, in relevant part:

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this subsection, the director may waive recovery of all or any part of overpaid benefits subject to repayment or deduction under ORS 657.310 (1) or 657.315 (1) if the director finds that recovery of the benefits would be against equity and good conscience.

(b) The director may not waive recovery under this subsection of overpaid benefits that are subject to the penalty imposed under ORS 657.310 (2).

OAR 471-030-0053 (June 23, 2024) provides, in relevant part:

\* \* \*

(2) This rule addresses waiving recovery of overpayments pursuant to ORS 657.317.

(3) Overpayments will be waived if recovery of benefits is against equity and good conscience based on the following criteria

(a) Automatic waiver criteria, the individual has claimant non-fault overpayment and

(A) Has reported wages in the last four quarters that are less than or equal to 300% of the federal poverty level for a family of four, OR

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

\* \* \*

(11) In applying ORS 657.317(3), a waiver will not be granted if the overpayment is a result of willful misrepresentation or fraud as established in ORS 657.215.

\* \* \*

The record shows that claimant was overpaid \$17,492 in combined PUA and FPUC benefits for the weeks at issue. The May 24, 2022, PUA determination established that claimant was ineligible to receive PUA benefits for the weeks at issue, and that determination has not been disturbed on appeal. Further, the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision, which also has not been disturbed on appeal, established that claimant was paid at least \$17,492 in combined PUA and FPUC benefits during the weeks at issue, and due at least in part to the May 24, 2022, PUA determination, those benefits were overpaid. The Department asserts that recovery of this overpayment cannot be waived because the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision also established, as a matter of law, that the overpayment was fraudulent and therefore caused by claimant. The Department's Argument at 1. The record does not support this assertion.

**Fraud as a Bar to Waiver.** Pursuant to federal guidance, “[u]nder no circumstances” may recovery of an overpayment of PUA or FPUC benefits caused by fraud be waived. UIPL No. 20-21 Change 1 at 7. Federal law defers to state law criteria for establishing a fraud determination for purposes of PUA and FPUC overpayments and waivers. UIPL No. 20-21 Change 1 at 7. Oregon's law in that regard, ORS 657.215, deems an overpayment to have been caused by fraud when the claimant “willfully made a false statement or misrepresentation, or willfully failed to report a material fact, to obtain any benefits.” The June 1, 2022, overpayment decision asserted that this was the cause of the overpayment at issue and imposed a 30 percent monetary penalty pursuant to that statute, and has not been disturbed on appeal.

The Department offered no evidence at hearing regarding the causes of the overpayment beyond reading portions of the May 24, 2022, PUA determination and June 1, 2022, overpayment decisions into the record. The Department's representative did not assert that she had any other knowledge of the circumstances surrounding claimant's PUA claim or why the Department concluded that the overpayment was caused by fraud or claimant fault. The Department's contention that the waiver request is precluded by the overpayment having been caused by fraud relies largely, if not exclusively, on the May 24, 2022, and June 1, 2022, administrative decisions. However, despite the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision's conclusion that claimant was overpaid due to a willful misrepresentation to obtain benefits, the four findings of fact (numbered two through five in the decision) on which this conclusion relies, even if presumed to be true, do not support such the assertion that the overpayment was caused by fraud or claimant fault.

The first and sixth findings of fact in the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision related only to the amount of the overpayment, while the second through fifth findings related to the causes. The second finding of fact cited the underlying May 24, 2022, PUA determination, concluding that claimant was ineligible for PUA benefits “as [she] failed to provide evidence as requested for self-employment.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. However, simply failing to provide corroborating documentation does not evince that claimant provided false or misleading information about her self-employment, or that a fact material to that subject was withheld. The third finding of fact stated that claimant was discharged “for a non-covid reason,” but did not assert when the discharge occurred, or that claimant failed to accurately and timely report the separation to the Department. The fourth finding of fact asserted, “Proof of earnings provided were insufficient to establish PUA eligibility[.]” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. As with the second finding of fact, the lack of documentation corroborating representations claimant made regarding her claim does not evince that she made a false or misleading statement or that a material fact was withheld. The fifth finding of fact asserted that claimant “is not licensed in the State of Oregon to perform this type of work.” EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. This, too, fails to show that claimant falsely represented having any

particular license or willfully misled the Department to believe that she had one, or whether possession of such a license was material to her PUA claim.<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, while the findings of fact were sufficient to support the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision's conclusion that claimant was overpaid \$17,492 in PUA and FPUC benefits, they were insufficient to support the conclusion that claimant was, as a matter of law, overpaid due to fraud or subject to the monetary penalty as provided in ORS 657.215. The Department provided no additional evidence of fraud at hearing, as previously discussed. Accordingly, despite the finality of the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision, the Department has not established by a preponderance of the evidence that the overpayment was caused by fraud. Under these circumstances, consideration of claimant's waiver request is not barred by the provisions of federal law prohibiting waivers in cases of established claimant fraud.

**Fault for the Overpayment.** The next consideration in the waiver analysis is whether claimant is "without fault" in causing the overpayment. The June 1, 2022, overpayment decision implicitly concluded that claimant was at fault for the overpayment under the state law standard set forth in ORS 657.310(1). However, that statute assigns fault "regardless of the individual's knowledge or intent" if they "made or caused to be made a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, or failed to disclose a material fact." In contrast, the federal standard applicable to claimant's waiver request considers a claimant to be without fault if they "provided all information correctly as requested by the state, but the state failed to take appropriate action with that information or took delayed action when determining eligibility," or they "provided incorrect information due to conflicting, changing, or confusing information or instructions from the state . . . in understanding what information the state needed from the individual[.]" UIPL 20-21 Change 1, at 9-10. Considering these differing standards, the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision does not establish, as a matter of law, that claimant was at fault for the overpayment under the federal standard.

As with the allegation of fraud, the Department's evidence supporting the assertion that claimant was at fault for the overpayment was limited to the findings of fact contained in the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision. That decision asserted that claimant was overpaid, in part, due to being discharged at an undisclosed time "for a non-covid reason," but did not state that claimant failed to accurately provide all information requested about that work separation. The decision also asserted that claimant was overpaid, in part, because she failed to provide requested information regarding self-employment such that the Department could corroborate to their satisfaction that claimant met PUA eligibility requirements. In rebuttal to this assertion, claimant testified that she provided several items of documentary evidence in April 2021 and received an email shortly thereafter, stating, "Thank you for providing proof of self-employment. We . . . have reviewed your documentation and determined you have met this requirement." Transcript at 27-28. Claimant also provided portions of an email exchange with a Department representative, which likely occurred shortly before the May 24, 2022, PUA determination was issued, and which stated, "If you choose to, please submit your 2019 IRS tax transcript or [profit and loss] statement within 5 business days of this email." Exhibit 2 at 4. Claimant did not submit the tax transcript or profit and loss statement because she questioned the legitimacy of the email as it requested her social security number and other identifying information, was sent during a time there were other

---

<sup>5</sup> It is unclear from the record what type of license the Department expected claimant to have in relation to her self-employment.

scams occurring, and came months after the end of the PUA program and more than a year after the Department had informed her that it had found her proof of self-employment satisfactory. Transcript 26-27.

In considering this evidence, the Department has not shown that claimant was overpaid because she provided incorrect information or failed to disclose a material fact. To some extent, the Department considered claimant ineligible for PUA and, thus, overpaid, because she failed to provide additional requested information in or around May 2024. However, this failure was attributable to conflicting or confusing information provided by the Department to claimant, including phrasing the request as being optional, and it contradicting an email sent to claimant a year earlier stating that claimant had satisfied the requirement to provide evidence of self-employment. Accordingly, under federal guidance, claimant is not at fault for the overpayment.

**Repayment as Contrary to Equity and Good Conscience.** The final consideration in the waiver analysis is whether requiring repayment of the overpayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. Under UIPL 20-21 Change 1, the Department had the option to use either the state or federal standard in defining what it means for repayment to be contrary to equity and good conscience. The Department's representative testified that, due to the Department's belief that the overpayment was caused by fraud and was therefore ineligible to be waived, they did not determine whether requiring repayment of the overpayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. Transcript at 12. Therefore, the record does not show whether the Department elected to use the state or federal standard in that regard.

Under the federal standard, claimant has shown that repayment would cause her financial hardship. Claimant testified that since prior to the June 18, 2024, waiver request, she has remained unemployed. Transcript at 38. Claimant further testified that she and her family received food and medical benefits under means tested programs. Transcript at 28. Moreover, the order under review took notice, without objection of the parties, that claimant reported in the waiver request that her income equaled her monthly expenses. Order No. 25-UI-291719 at 2. Accordingly, claimant has shown that repayment of the \$17,492 overpayment would cause financial hardship, and therefore would be contrary to equity and good conscience under federal standard.

Under the state standard, because this is considered a "non-fault" overpayment for the reasons discussed above, the automatic waiver criteria of 471-030-0053(3)(a) apply. The Department's records show that claimant had no reported income for the four calendar quarters preceding her June 18, 2024, waiver request (the second quarter of 2023 through the first quarter of 2024). Therefore, pursuant to 471-030-0053(3)(a)(A), repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience. Accordingly, claimant met the applicable requirements under either standard.

For these reasons, claimant's request to waive recovery of the overpayment of PUA and FPUC benefits assessed in the June 1, 2022, overpayment decision is not barred as being caused by fraud or claimant fault, and recovery of the overpayment would be against equity and good conscience. Accordingly, claimant's June 18, 2024, waiver request is granted.

**DECISION:** Order No. 25-UI-291719 is affirmed.



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

**DATE of Service: June 26, 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 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](mailto:appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov)

Website: [www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx](http://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.