

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2025-EAB-0492

Affirmed
Disqualification

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On April 2, 2025, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that the employer discharged claimant, but not for misconduct, and claimant therefore was not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on the work separation (decision # L0010102788). The employer filed a timely request for hearing. On May 19, 2025, ALJ Parnell convened a hearing and granted the employer's request for a postponement. On May 19, 2025, OAH served notice of a hearing on decision # L0010102788 scheduled for June 9, 2025. On June 9, 2025, ALJ Parnell conducted a hearing at which claimant failed to appear. On June 13, 2025, ALJ Parnell issued Order No. 25-UI-294910, reversing decision # L0010102788 by concluding that claimant was discharged for misconduct and therefore was disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 2, 2025. On June 16, 2025, claimant filed a timely request to reopen.

On July 17, 2025 and continued to August 4, 2025, ALJ Parnell conducted a hearing on claimant's request to reopen and the merits of decision # L0010102788. On August 6, 2025, ALJ Parnell issued Order No. 25-UI-299786, granting claimant's request to reopen, cancelling Order No. 25-UI-294910, and reversing decision # L0010102788 by concluding that claimant was discharged for misconduct and therefore was disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 2, 2025. On August 9, 2025, claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 25-UI-299786 with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

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

PARTIAL ADOPTION: 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-299786 granting claimant's request to reopen. That part of Order No. 25-UI-299785 is **adopted**. See ORS 657.275(2).

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Comprehensive Options for Drug Abusers (CODA), Inc. employed claimant from May 28, 2024 until March 3, 2025. Claimant was a qualified mental health associate certified under the Mental Health and Addiction Certification Board of Oregon (MHACBO). Claimant

worked as a residential administrator of a facility that provided housing to clients who were discharged from mental health hospitals.

(2) The employer expected their employees to maintain professional boundaries between themselves and the clients the employer served. Under this policy, claimant was barred from communicating with clients about personal matters outside the scope of their treatment in the residence.

(3) Shortly after claimant was hired, the employer gave him a digital copy of their employee handbook, which contained their professional boundaries policy. On June 13, 2024, claimant completed a new employee orientation which included a section on professional boundaries and work ethics. On that date, the employer's human resources (HR) director gave a presentation to claimant on professional boundaries. Claimant initialed and dated a new employee checklist indicating he had completed the professional boundaries training on June 13, 2024. Exhibit 1 at 11.

(4) Claimant's MHACBO certification also established expectations relating to maintaining professional boundaries with clients. Claimant's certification was governed by a code of conduct that included provisions relating to carrying on multiple or dual relationships with clients and virtual relationships with clients. The expectations relating to multiple or dual relationships provided that, "Behavioral Health Professionals . . . shall make every effort to avoid multiple relationships with a client." Exhibit 3 at 8. The expectations relating to virtual relationships provided that, "Behavioral Health Professionals . . . are prohibited from engaging in personal . . . text messaging . . . with current or former clients." Exhibit 3 at 10.

(5) The employer regarded maintaining professional boundaries as necessary to ensure the safety of the their clients and employees. Failure of an employee to maintain professional boundaries could expose the employer to liability or place the employer's licensure in jeopardy.

(6) At some point during his employment, claimant made a report to state authorities alleging that the employer had engaged in fraud and neglect of clients.

(7) The employer had a procedure that allowed clients to file grievances with the employer. As an administrator, claimant had limited involvement with client grievances; the employer primarily addressed grievances through a quality assurance team made up of employees responsible for providing client care. On a date near in time to February 28, 2025, one of the clients at the facility where claimant worked filed a grievance about whether the client could self-administer their medication. Claimant used his personal cell phone to begin a text thread with the client discussing the client's grievance.

(8) On February 25, 2025, one of the employer's HR managers determined that an employee on claimant's team who was facing discharge for absenteeism had checked into a treatment facility and attained a protected status from discharge, and would therefore be returning to work on a particular date. That day, the HR manager called claimant and spoke with him about the employee. Claimant was insistent that the employee be discharged, but the HR manager told claimant that the employee would be returning to work. Claimant told the HR manager, "do what you want," and hung up on her. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 18.

(9) On February 26, 2025, the HR manager emailed claimant attempting to schedule a time for a phone conversation to go over details of the employee's return. Claimant responded, "We can stick to email. Feel free to message whatever you need[.]" Exhibit 3 at 21. The HR manager thought it imprudent to discuss details of the employee's status via email, and emailed back insisting on a phone conversation and offering numerous times during the next two days in which to meet. Exhibit 3 at 22. Claimant responded, "After our last conversation and being forced to take an employee who was already terminated, I don't feel comfortable or safe having conversations with you that aren't documented." Exhibit 3 at 23. Because claimant declined to have a phone conversation and had stated that he was not comfortable with the HR manager, the HR manager referred the matter of discussing the employee's return to her supervisor, the HR director.

(10) On February 28, 2025, at 11:57 a.m., the HR director contacted claimant by text message and tried to set up an in-person meeting in the afternoon that day to discuss the returning employee and to coach claimant on his unwillingness to meet with the HR manager. Exhibit 3 at 24. Claimant responded, "I don't have any time today. Thanks!" Exhibit 3 at 24. The HR director texted back that the meeting was not optional, to which claimant responded, "I don't have time. Sorry[.]" Exhibit 3 at 24. At 12:04 p.m., the HR director again texted that claimant was required to meet and needed to cancel whatever else was on his schedule. Exhibit 3 at 24. Claimant did not respond.

(11) On February 28, 2025, at 12:27 p.m. claimant sent an email with the subject line "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" to the employer's CEO. Exhibit 3 at 25. In the email, claimant complained about the employer's staffing practices, mentioned a healthcare provider who claimant asserted would not provide therapy, and alleged favoritism shown to employees who were friends of claimant's supervisor. Exhibit 3 at 25. Claimant further stated in the email:

I am being forced to take an employee who quit and is unreliable and who the staff doesn't want there. While I try to set professional boundaries and they continue to be violated. The latest example of this is not having undocumented conversations due to how [the HR manager] and HR handles situations. I'm being harassed and having my boundaries violated being told I have to clear my schedule and do all these things to come down and have an undocumented conversation. I don't feel safe doing this. Especially with how I have been treated during my time here. And seeing how other people with special treatment can do whatever they want with no recourse.

Exhibit 3 at 25.

(12) The HR director was copied on claimant's "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email, and emailed back, "Receiving the email, but we still need to meet either at 1:30, 2:30 or 3:30 today[.]" August 4, 2025 Transcript at 41. Claimant did not respond, and each of the afternoon meeting times the HR director had proposed passed.

(13) On February 28, 2025 at 4:30 p.m., the HR director emailed claimant that, as a result of not making himself available to meet, the employer was placing him on administrative leave effective immediately. The HR director instructed claimant to come to the office the morning of the next working day, March 3, 2025, for a meeting. The employer's intent at that time was not to discharge claimant at the meeting, but to coach him on his unwillingness to meet and discuss details of the employee's return to work.

(14) On February 28, 2025 at 6:28 p.m., claimant sent a new text message to the client on the existing thread they had used to discuss the client's grievance. In the text, claimant stated:

Hey [client]. I was placed on leave today. Keep fighting for your meds. It's your right. I'm assuming they will fire me. I just wanted to stand up for you guys and get you all the help you needed. I guess [the employer] didn't want that!

Exhibit 1 at 3. The client texted back, "Please don't go. You are too big of an asset to us residents." Exhibit 1 at 3. Claimant then texted:

I don't want to go I know you guys need Me. I will stay in touch. If [claimant's supervisor] fires me do you want me to stay in touch with you?

Exhibit 1 at 3. The client texted back, "Yes please." Exhibit 1 at 3.

(15) Later on the evening of February 28, 2025, the client made the employer aware of the text messages claimant had sent to him that evening, and gave the employer copies of the text messages. The employer determined that claimant's text messages to the client violated their expectation that claimant maintain professional boundaries and warranted discharging him.

(16) On March 3, 2025, claimant met with the HR director and an HR generalist. In the meeting, the two presented claimant with his February 28, 2025 texts to the client. Claimant acknowledged sending the texts to the client but stated that he did not know that the messages violated the policy. That day, the employer discharged claimant for failing to maintain professional boundaries by sending the February 28, 2025 text messages to the client.

(17) After discharging claimant, the employer reported claimant's February 28, 2025 text messages to MHACBO, as was required by law.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: The employer discharged claimant for misconduct.

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 employer discharged claimant because they determined that he failed to maintain professional boundaries by sending the February 28, 2025 text messages to the client. In his written argument, claimant asserted that the employer discharged him for "whistle blowing," pointing to the fact that his discharge took place a few days after he sent the "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email on February 28, 2025. Claimant's Written Argument at 1. In fact, the record shows that the employer discharged claimant because of the February 28, 2025 text messages.

First, at hearing, the HR director, HR manager, and HR generalist each testified repeatedly and uniformly that claimant's February 28, 2025 text messages to the client were why claimant was discharged. June 9, 2025 Transcript at 5, 6-7, 15, 23; August 4, 2025 Transcript at 5, 9, 15, 16, 18, 44. The HR director testified that he presented the text messages to claimant during the discharge meeting and told him the texts were why the employer was discharging him. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 21. Claimant conceded at hearing that the employer presented the text messages to him at the meeting and cited them as the reason he was being discharged. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 24.

Further, while it is correct that claimant's discharge occurred on March 3, 2025, which was a few days after claimant sent the "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email, the discharge was likewise a few days after claimant sent the text messages to the client, as both the email to the CEO and the text messages to the client were sent by claimant on February 28, 2025. The HR director and HR manager testified that the employer insisted on a meeting with claimant to enable them to discuss details of the protected-status employee's return and to coach claimant on his unwillingness to meet with HR, not anything to do with claimant's "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email, and that the HR director placed claimant on administrative leave on February 28, 2025 at 4:30 p.m. because claimant had not made himself available to meet. June 9, 2025 Transcript at 8-9, 11-13, 18-20; August 4, 2025 Transcript at 9, 17-18, 37, 40-42.

That claimant's suspension was due to claimant's refusal to meet and not the result of claimant's "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email is also bolstered by the evidence that the HR director sent his texts to claimant between 11:57 a.m. and 12:04 p.m., directing him to meet, which was before claimant sent his 12:27 p.m. "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 41; *see also* Exhibit 3 at 24. After claimant sent the "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email, the HR director emailed back that he had "receiv[ed]" claimant's email, but that the two "still need[ed]" to meet either at 1:30, 2:30 or 3:30 today[.]" August 4, 2025 Transcript at 41. Only after those proposed time slots passed that day did the HR director suspend claimant, at 4:30 p.m. Later that evening, at 6:28 p.m., claimant sent his texts messages to the client, and sometime that evening, later still, the client made the employer aware of them. The HR director credibly testified that the employer then "did the research over the weekend on what this is" and determined that the text messages violated their professional boundaries policy and warranted discharge. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 9.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, the record shows that claimant's February 28, 2025 text messages to the client were the proximate cause of claimant's discharge and therefore are the focus of the discharge analysis.¹ *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).

Claimant's February 28, 2025 text messages violated the employer's professional boundaries policy. The professional boundaries policy prohibited claimant from communicating with clients about personal matters outside the scope of their treatment in the residence. The February 28, 2025 text messages represented the final portion of a texting thread that may have originally had a purely professional purpose, since it had been used to discuss the client's grievance. However, several aspects of the content of the text messages claimant sent to the client on February 28, 2025 violated the professional boundaries policy.

First, by making the statements, "I was placed on leave today" and "I'm assuming they will fire me," claimant exceeded professional boundaries by conveying personal information to the client about the status of claimant's employment and his belief that he would lose his job. Exhibit 1 at 3. Second, in

¹ Additionally, at hearing and in his written argument, claimant asserted that during the phone call with the HR manager on February 25, 2025, the HR manager told claimant that "you're going to get fired." August 4, 2025 Transcript at 34; Claimant's Written Argument at 1. At hearing, the HR manager repeatedly testified that the conversation during the call was about the HR manager telling claimant that the protected-status employee would be returning to work, which displeased claimant and resulted in him saying "do what you want" and abruptly hanging up. June 9, 2025 Transcript at 19; August 4, 2025 Transcript at 18. For his part, claimant testified that the HR manager specifically said during the February 25, 2025 call, "you're going to get fired" but did not say why, and claimant did not ask her why but simply ended the call. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 34. Notably, in claimant's February 26, 2025 email response rebuffing the HR manager's attempt to schedule a meeting and insisting that all conversations be documented, claimant made no mention of the HR manager having allegedly told him he was going to be fired in their previous call. *See* Exhibit 3 at 23. Also, in claimant's February 28, 2025 "Toxic work place/ Nepotism" email, claimant lodged complaints on numerous topics, including the prospect of the protected-status employee returning to work on his team, but made no assertion that the HR manager had told him during their call that the employer would discharge him. Exhibit 3 at 25. In weighing this evidence, the accounts of the witnesses are balanced and claimant's contemporaneous written communications lack details corroborating claimant's account. The record therefore fails to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the HR manager told claimant during the call that "you're going to get fired."

stating, “I just wanted to stand up for you guys and get you all the help you needed. I guess [the employer] didn’t want that!” claimant crossed professional boundaries by characterizing the employer in a negative light and implying that he was interested in helping the client, but that the employer was not. Exhibit 1 at 3. Third, claimant stated to the client “I will stay in touch” and “If [claimant’s supervisor] fires me do you want me to stay in touch with you?” Exhibit 1 at 3. At the time claimant made these statements, he anticipated losing his job and that his professional relationship with the client would end. The messages breached professional boundaries because they amounted to an invitation to create a relationship that was personal in nature that would continue after claimant’s anticipated work separation.

Claimant’s February 28, 2025 text messages violated the employer’s professional boundaries policy with wanton negligence. When the employer showed claimant the text messages at the March 3, 2025 discharge meeting, claimant acknowledged sending them to the client but stated that he did not know that the messages violated the policy. This may suggest that claimant did not intend to violate the policy, and so did not act willfully. Nevertheless, the record demonstrates that claimant’s breach of the professional boundaries policy was wantonly negligent.

The employer trained claimant on the professional boundaries policy. On June 13, 2024, claimant completed a new employee orientation, which included a section on professional boundaries. On that date, the HR director gave a presentation to claimant on professional boundaries, and claimant initialed and dated a new employee checklist indicating that he had completed the training. Exhibit 1 at 11. Shortly after claimant was hired, the employer gave him a digital copy of their employee handbook, which contained the policy. Claimant also was a qualified mental health associate certified under MHACBO. Claimant’s certification was governed by a code of conduct that imposed similar expectations relating to professional boundaries, including provisions calling for claimant to “make every effort to avoid multiple relationships with a client” and providing that “Behavioral Health Professionals” like claimant “are prohibited from engaging in personal . . . text messaging . . . with current or former clients.” Exhibit 3 at 8, 10.

Given the training claimant received, as well as the overlap with the MHACBO code of conduct, there is ample support to conclude that, when claimant sent the client the February 28, 2025 text messages, he should have known that a violation of the employer’s expectations would probably result. As claimant also sent the text messages consciously and with indifference to the consequences of his actions, the record shows that claimant’s February 28, 2025 text messages were wantonly negligent violations of the employer’s professional boundaries policy.

Claimant’s wantonly negligent violation was not an isolated instance of poor judgment. Claimant’s failure to maintain professional boundaries exceeded mere poor judgment because it made a continued employment relationship impossible. At hearing, the HR director testified that maintaining professional boundaries was necessary to ensure the safety of both clients and employees. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 6. The HR manager stated that within the employer’s organization, “there is very little that is worse than . . . endangering . . . the treatment of patients by . . . establishing a relationship with them outside of the scope of your role and qualifications.” June 9, 2025 Transcript at 23. The HR director further testified that failure to meet the professional boundaries standard could expose the employer to liability, and interfered with the employer’s business because it potentially placed the employer’s own licensure in jeopardy. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 6, 10. The employer reported claimant’s communications to the client to MHACBO, as was required by law. August 4, 2025 Transcript at 19. Given that claimant’s

wantonly negligent violation of the professional boundaries policy had the potential to imperil the employer's licensure or place them in legal jeopardy, more likely than not, a continued employment relationship was impossible. Accordingly, claimant's conduct exceeded mere poor judgment and was not an isolated instance of poor judgment.

For these reasons, claimant's wantonly negligent violation of the professional boundaries policy was misconduct. Claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective March 2, 2025.

DECISION: Order No. 25-UI-299786 is affirmed.

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

DATE of Service: September 18, 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.