

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2025-EAB-0585

Reversed & Remanded

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On May 6, 2025, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant's request for waiver of recovery of his overpayment was allowed for the amount of \$527.89 (decision # L0010613238). On May 27, 2025, decision # L0010613238 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing. On May 28, 2025, claimant filed a late request for hearing on decision # L0010613238. On September 4, 2025, ALJ Frank convened a hearing, and, following a discussion with claimant, postponed the hearing to September 24, 2025 for claimant to consider whether to proceed with his appeal. On September 24, 2025, ALJ Frank convened a hearing, and following discussion with claimant, granted claimant's request to withdraw his hearing request. On September 24, 2025, ALJ Frank issued Order No. 25-UI-304873, dismissing claimant's request for hearing based on claimant's withdrawal of his hearing request. On October 6, 2025, claimant filed an application for review of Order No. 25-UI-304873 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 claimant's hearing request referral form and decision # L0010613238, 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.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) At some point prior to May 1, 2025, claimant received unemployment insurance benefits to which he was not entitled. The Department assessed an overpayment against claimant based on his receipt of these benefits.

(2) On May 1, 2025, claimant called the Department, seeking to file an overpayment waiver request. A Department representative "setup the OP waiver benefit issue" and took information on claimant's

household size and employment and earnings, among other things. Claimant told the representative that he would submit additional documents.¹

(3) On May 2, 2025, the Department received a payment from the Oregon Department of Revenue (DOR). The May 2, 2025 DOR payment was money that DOR considered to otherwise be due to claimant, but that it paid to the Department to apply against claimant's overpayment of benefits.²

(4) Also on May 2, 2025, claimant communicated to the Department that he intended to send to it on May 5, 2025 documents relating to his earnings. On May 5, 2025, a Department representative approved claimant's overpayment waiver request.³

(5) On May 6, 2025, the Department issued decision # L0010613238, which concluded that claimant's request for waiver of recovery of his overpayment was allowed for the amount of \$527.89. EAB Exhibit 1 at 2. Decision # L0010613238, stated, "You have the right to appeal our decision and request a hearing if you believe our decision is wrong. We must receive your request for a hearing no later than **May 27, 2025.**" EAB Exhibit 1 at 3.

(6) On May 12, 2025, claimant called the Department and spoke to a representative. The representative told claimant that the Department had received a payment from DOR on May 2, 2025 in the amount of \$982.81. Claimant asked if he could get the DOR payment refunded. The representative told claimant that they would get back to claimant about the matter. On May 21, 2025, claimant called the Department and asked again about getting the May 2, 2025 DOR payment refunded.⁴

(7) On May 27, 2025, decision # L0010613238 became final without claimant having filed a request for hearing.

¹ EAB has taken notice of the facts contained in this paragraph, which are 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 facts will remain in the record.

² EAB has taken notice of the facts contained in this paragraph, which are 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 facts will remain in the record.

³ EAB has taken notice of the facts contained in this paragraph, which are 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 facts will remain in the record.

⁴ EAB has taken notice of the facts contained in this paragraph, which are 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 facts will remain in the record.

(8) On May 28, 2025, claimant again called the Department asking about a refund of the May 2, 2025 DOR payment. A representative “explained to claimant that the refund would be coming from [DOR].” The representative helped claimant request a hearing on decision # L0010613238 by phone.⁵

(9) In claimant’s hearing request referral, claimant stated, in pertinent part:

Applied for waiver over the phone on May 1, 2025. The overpayment amount at the time was \$1,292.24. Revenue submitted a payment for \$982.81 on May 2, 2025. The waiver was proc[essed] and approved for \$527.89 on May 6, 2025. Due to the waiver being processed on May 6, 2025, I am requesting a refund of \$982.81. . . . The appeal is being submitted one day late due to the office being closed on 5/26/25 and the office phone line was closed on 5/27/2025.

EAB Exhibit 1 at 1.

(10) On September 4, 2025, ALJ Frank convened a hearing on claimant’s appeal. During the September 4, 2025 hearing, the following exchange occurred:

ALJ: Okay. I can’t make the amount bigger. All I can do is affirm or set aside this decision. I’ve read your appeal. What you want is something I can’t do. And in fact, if you were to have this hearing, you would only be running the risk of me overturning it and even disallowing this \$527.89 and taking it to zero. Because, this is a decision made in your favor. Understand what I’m saying—**Claimant:** yes sir—

Claimant: Yes sir, can I, can I, um, tell you my side?

ALJ: Well, that’s having a hearing. Do you understand what I’m telling you that, you, you’ve appealed a favorable decision. And if you were to have a hearing you would run the risk that I could overturn it. And not even allow the \$527.89, what I can’t do is make it bigger. Do you understand all this?

Claimant: No, I don’t sir.

ALJ: The decision allows your request for waiver. If you had a hearing, I could deny it. Do you understand this?

September 4, 2025 Audio Record at 1:01. After claimant responded that he was confused, the ALJ postponed the hearing to September 24, 2025 for claimant to consider whether to proceed with his appeal.

⁵ EAB has taken notice of the facts contained in this paragraph, which are 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 facts will remain in the record.

(11) On September 24, 2025, ALJ Frank convened a hearing. Claimant appeared and stated that he had not been able to obtain legal representation, was “not real sure” what to do, and had “felt threatened last time [he] spoke with” the ALJ. September 24, 2025 Audio Record at 2:54. Claimant stated that he thought in the first hearing that the ALJ had said he “could charge [claimant] or something” and the ALJ clarified, “No, I said I could overturn the decision.” September 24, 2025 Audio Record at 3:19. The ALJ stated that claimant could either proceed with the hearing or withdraw his appeal. September 24, 2025 Audio Record at 4:01. Claimant stated that he was confused and added “so this is not, uh uh, beneficial for me? To have a hearing?” September 24, 2025 Audio Record at 4:15. The ALJ responded as follows:

ALJ: That’s what I was trying to, that’s what I was trying to explain. It says, it allows the waiver. It is in your favor. This decision—**Claimant:** Correct.—**ALJ:** that’s what I was trying to explain to you.

Claimant: Okay.

ALJ: I was asking if you wanted to withdraw your appeal. Would you like to withdraw?

Claimant: Yes sir, I think so.

ALJ: Okay, we’ll do that. Thank you for appearing to tell me.

September 24, 2025 Audio Record at 4:27. Later that day, ALJ Frank issued Order No. 25-UI-304873, dismissing claimant’s request for hearing based on claimant’s withdrawal of his hearing request.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Order No. 25-UI-304873 is reversed and the matter remanded for a hearing on whether claimant’s late request for hearing should be allowed. If claimant’s late request for hearing is allowed, the ALJ shall address the merits of decision # L0010613238, which is whether to modify the decision to adjust the overpayment amount waived, so that claimant may be refunded a higher dollar amount that includes the May 2, 2025 DOR payment.

Dismissal of Hearing Request. ORS 657.270(7)(a)(A) provides, in pertinent part, that “[t]he administrative law judge may dismiss a request for hearing” if “[t]he request for hearing is withdrawn by the requesting party[.]”

Order No. 25-UI-304873 concluded that claimant withdrew his request for hearing and dismissed claimant’s hearing request on that basis. Order No. 25-UI-304873 at 1. Because claimant’s withdrawal was not knowingly and voluntarily made, the ALJ erred in allowing claimant’s request to withdraw, and dismissing his hearing request on that basis.

Although ORS 657.270(7)(a)(A) authorizes an ALJ to dismiss a hearing request where the requesting party requests to withdraw, principles of due process require that a party’s withdrawal request be knowing and voluntary, meaning that the request must not be the result of a reasonable mistaken belief arising from misinformation provided by the ALJ.

The ALJ misinformed claimant in two ways. First, the ALJ incorrectly explained that his authority was limited to either affirming or setting aside the administrative decision. September 4, 2025 Audio Record

at 1:01 (“All I can do is affirm or set aside this decision. I’ve read your appeal. What you want is something I can’t do. . . what I can’t do is make it bigger.”). The ALJ’s explanation was incorrect because administrative law judges are empowered to modify administrative decisions issued by the Department. *See* ORS 657.270(4)(a) (“After the administrative law judge has given all parties reasonable opportunity for a fair hearing, the administrative law judge shall promptly affirm, modify or set aside the decision of the authorized representative with respect to the claim.”) (emphasis added). By failing to explain that he had the authority to modify decision # L0010613238 in claimant’s favor, the ALJ improperly caused claimant to form the mistaken belief that going forward with the hearing was pointless.

Second, the ALJ inappropriately stated that if claimant went forward with the hearing, the ALJ could reverse the administrative decision and overturn the Department’s conclusion that claimant was entitled to a waiver. September 4, 2025 Audio Record at 1:11 (“If you were to have this hearing, you would only be running the risk of me overturning it and even disallowing this \$527.89 and taking it to zero. . . . The decision allows your request for waiver. If you had a hearing, I could deny it.”); September 24, 2025 Audio Record at 3:24 (“I said I could overturn the decision, which allows you a waiver.”). The ALJ’s explanation was incorrect because neither claimant nor OED contested claimant’s entitlement to waiver of the overpayment and therefore whether to grant or deny the waiver of claimant’s overpayment was not at issue. The Department granted claimant the waiver, as expressed in decision # L0010613238. Claimant appealed the amount of the waiver that was granted, seeking an upward adjustment of the overpayment amount waived, so that he may be refunded a higher dollar amount. *See* EAB Exhibit 1 at 1 (“Due to the waiver being processed on May 6, 2025, I am requesting a refund of \$982.81.”). Thus, the issue before the ALJ was whether the overpayment amount waived should be adjusted upward, and whether claimant was entitled to a refund of that upwardly adjusted amount, not whether claimant’s entitlement to the waiver should be granted or denied.

The ALJ’s comments had the potential to instill fear in claimant that going forward with the hearing could mean losing the gains he had made to that point. Claimant may have interpreted the ALJ’s comments as a threat that if he did not withdraw his request for hearing, he would be penalized by having his entitlement to the waiver overturned. The comments thus caused claimant to mistakenly believe that he risked losing entitlement to the waiver and induced him to abandon the appeal.

Inducing the claimant to withdraw his request for hearing is problematic because it is possible that claimant may prevail on remand, if the merits are reached. Claimant might do so if he can establish that the Department recovered the DOR payment *after* he filed his waiver request. OAR 471-030-0053(8) (June 23, 2024) states, “Overpaid benefits that have been recovered prior to the filing of a waiver request will not be waived or refunded.” It logically follows from this provision that if overpaid benefits are recovered after a waiver request is filed, they are subject to being waived or refunded.

Claimant initiated the waiver request by calling the Department on May 1, 2025.⁶ The Department received the DOR payment on May 2, 2025. Department records suggest that claimant may have sent

⁶ OAR 471-030-0053(6) states, “Waivers are effective the Sunday of the week in which the request for waiver was filed with OED. OED shall apply the provisions under OAR 471-010-0040 in determining the date the request for waiver is received.” OAR 471-010-0040(2) and (3) (December 25, 2025), provide, in pertinent part, that when a document is filed by mail, the filing date is the postmarked date affixed by the U.S. Postal Service, and when a document is filed by fax, the filing date is

documents in support of his waiver request on May 5, 2025. If the waiver request was filed on May 1, 2025 when claimant initiated the request by calling the Department, then the DOR payment recovered on May 2, 2025 may be subject to being refunded. That would warrant modifying decision # L0010613238 to upwardly adjust the overpayment amount waived, so that claimant may be refunded a higher dollar amount that includes the DOR payment. However, the record must be developed to determine the date the waiver request was filed, if, on remand, claimant's late request for hearing is allowed and the merits issue is reached.

The incorrect information provided by the ALJ was sufficient to give rise to claimant's reasonable but mistaken belief that the ALJ could not modify the overpayment amount waived and going forward meant risking loss of the waiver he had already been granted. This resulted in claimant withdrawing his hearing request. Because claimant's withdrawal was the result of a reasonable mistaken belief caused by the ALJ, it was not a knowing and voluntary withdrawal. The hearing request therefore was not withdrawn consistent with due process principles. As such, the dismissal of claimant's hearing request must be reversed.

Issues on Remand. The threshold issue on remand is whether claimant's late request for hearing should be allowed.

ORS 657.269 states that the Department's decisions become final unless a party files a request for hearing within 20 days after the date the decision is mailed. ORS 657.875 states that the 20-day deadline may be extended a "reasonable time" upon a showing of "good cause." OAR 471-040-0010 (February 10, 2012) states that "good cause" includes factors beyond an applicant's reasonable control or an excusable mistake, and defines "reasonable time" as seven days after those factors ended.

The deadline to file a request for hearing on decision # L0010613238 was May 27, 2025. Because claimant did not file his request for hearing until May 28, 2025, the request for hearing was late.

On remand, the ALJ should ask claimant when he received decision # L0010613238, whether he read and disagreed with it, and why he did not request a hearing on the decision until one day after the May 27, 2025 deadline to do so. The ALJ should inquire whether claimant's calls to the Department on May 12 and May 21, 2025 affected his decision not to appeal on those dates, such as if the representatives with which claimant spoke left a reasonable impression on claimant that his refund request was under review and might be granted, and that they would get back to claimant later. The ALJ should inquire about the barriers to appealing claimant may have faced relating to office closures on May 26, 2025 and the assertion that the "phone line was closed" on May 27, 2025. The ALJ should ask whether claimant had access to other methods of filing a hearing request, such as via the internet, mail, or fax. If the record on remand shows claimant had good cause to file on May 28, 2025, the hearing request was necessarily filed within a seven-day reasonable time as it occurred one day after the May 27, 2025 deadline.

If claimant's late request for hearing is allowed, the next issue on remand is whether to modify decision # L0010613238 to adjust the overpayment amount waived, so that claimant may be refunded a higher

the encoded date on the fax document. OAR 471-010-0040(4) states, in pertinent part, "When the document is filed by any other means, the date of filing shall be the date of delivery[.]"

dollar amount that includes the May 2, 2025 DOR payment. As discussed above, whether claimant is entitled to the waiver is uncontested and resolved in claimant's favor, and is not the proper focus on remand.

The first step of the inquiry on remand is to determine whether the May 2, 2025 DOR payment was recovered after claimant's waiver request was filed. OAR 471-030-0053(6) states, "Waivers are effective the Sunday of the week in which the request for waiver was filed with OED." Further, OAR 471-030-0053(8), states, "Overpaid benefits that have been recovered prior to the filing of a waiver request will not be waived or refunded." It logically follows from this provision that if overpaid benefits are recovered after a waiver request is filed, they are subject to being waived or refunded.

The ALJ should ask the Department's witness whether the Department considered the waiver request to have been filed on May 1, 2025, when claimant called the Department and a representative "setup the OP waiver benefit issue" and took information on claimant's household size and employment and earnings. If the witness testifies that the Department does not consider May 1, 2025 to be the filing date, the ALJ should ask why that is so, and what date the Department instead regards as the filing date, and why. If the evidence on remand establishes that the waiver request was filed on May 1, 2025, then it was improper for the Department to have recovered the May 2, 2025 DOR payment, and the DOR payment should be included as part of balance waived by decision # L0010613238.

If the May 2, 2025 DOR payment is thus included as part of the balance waived by decision # L0010613238, it is probable that the payment, which amounts to \$982.81, should be refunded to claimant. However, the ALJ should ask certain questions to clarify aspects of the refunding process. Department records show that in response to a May 12, 2025 call from claimant, a representative wrote a note, "It looks like we have received enough DOR payments that his OP is paid in full and now there is a credit on the acct. Sent an email to Cash Dispense for a refund review. Advised claimant of same."⁷ The ALJ should therefore inquire of the parties whether claimant has already received a refund and, if so, in what amount, and whether the refunded amount included the May 2, 2025 DOR payment.

Department records also show that in response to claimant's May 28, 2025 call, a representative wrote, "explained to claimant that the refund would be coming from [DOR]." The ALJ should inquire of the parties whether claimant has received the May 2, 2025 DOR payment of \$982.81 directly from DOR, and if not, whether the parties anticipate that DOR will refund the May 2, 2025 DOR payment to claimant, and, if so, why they anticipate that to be the case.

If the evidence on remand shows that the May 2, 2025 DOR payment was improperly recovered because the waiver request was filed on May 1, 2025, and therefore the \$982.81 DOR payment should not have been recovered and should be part of the balance waived by decision # L0010613238, and claimant has not otherwise been refunded that money, it may be warranted to modify decision # L0010613238 by adjusting the overpayment amount waived, and concluding that claimant is entitled to a refund of the May 2, 2025 DOR payment.

⁷ 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 facts will remain in the record.

Development of the record is necessary to decide whether claimant's late request for hearing should be allowed, and, if so, whether to modify decision # L0010613238 to upwardly adjust the overpayment amount waived, so that claimant may be refunded a higher dollar amount that includes the May 2, 2025 DOR payment. Order No. 25-UI-304873 is therefore reversed and this matter remanded to the Office of Administrative Hearings for another hearing and order.

DECISION: Order No. 25-UI-304873 is set aside, and this matter remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order.

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

DATE of Service: October 17, 2025

NOTE: Visit www.oregonlawhelp.org for information about finding free or low-cost legal help in Oregon.

NOTE: The failure of any party to appear at the hearing on remand will not reinstate Order No. 25-UI-304873 or return this matter to EAB. Only a timely application for review of the order mailed to the parties after the remand hearing will return this matter to EAB.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. If you are unable to complete the survey online and wish to have a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判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

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.