

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2026-EAB-0266

Reversed
No Disqualification

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On October 31, 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 # L0013791416). The employer filed a timely request for hearing. On February 24, 2026, ALJ Murray conducted a hearing, and on February 26, 2026, issued Order No. 26-UI-321695, reversing decision # L0013791416 by concluding that the employer discharged claimant for misconduct, and claimant therefore was disqualified from receiving benefits effective August 31, 2025. On March 17, 2026, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

EVIDENTIARY MATTER: In the employer's April 10, 2026 written argument, the employer requested that EAB consider additional evidence under OAR 471-041-0090(1)(b) (May 13, 2019). Specifically, the employer requested that pages from the employer's employee manual, that appear to reflect the employer's policy regarding use of abusive or foul language, be considered by EAB. *See* Employer's Argument at 6-7, 16-19. The employer also requested that certain emails from their payroll tax administrator be added to the hearing record. *See* Employer's Argument at 6-7, 20-24.

Under OAR 471-041-0090(1)(b), “Any party may request that EAB consider additional evidence, and EAB may allow such a request when the party offering the additional evidence establishes that: (A) The additional evidence is relevant and material to EAB’s determination, and (B) Factors or circumstances beyond the party’s reasonable control prevented the party from offering the additional evidence into the hearing record.”

The employer’s request is denied. As to both sets of documents, the employer failed to show that factors or circumstances beyond their reasonable control prevented them from offering the additional evidence into the hearing record. The employer assembled, served on claimant, and submitted to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), Exhibit 1, a packet of documents that include emails from the payroll tax administrator, and text exchanges between the employer’s owner and secretary. The employer failed to adequately explain how they were in a position to curate and successfully ensure admission into evidence this set of documents, but was unable to include with them the pages from the employee manual or additional emails from the payroll tax administrator.

The employer asserted that the employer’s owner “did not have access to” the employee manual at hearing “to read verbatim into the record” and that the emails from the payroll tax administrator “were not known or available to [the employer] until this past week[.]” Employer’s Argument at 6. However, as to the excerpts from the employee manual, since the employer demonstrated the ability to identify, serve, and submit to OAH numerous pages of documents that were admitted as Exhibit 1, including some of the owner’s text messages, it stands to reason that with diligence and proper preparation, the owner could have included the manual in the group of documents that were admitted as Exhibit 1, or had them at hand during the hearing to read into the record. Likewise, since numerous emails from the payroll tax administrator are present in Exhibit 1, the additional emails that the employer wishes to admit now most likely could have become known and available to them and included with the batch of documents that were admitted as Exhibit 1, if the employer had exercised due diligence. Therefore, the employer’s request is denied because they have not shown that it was beyond their reasonable control to have obtained admission at hearing of the additional documents included with their written argument.

Next, review of the preliminary portion of the hearing shows that another evidentiary matter needs to be addressed. Specifically, claimant offered three pages of documents, including a cover email, which the ALJ marked as Exhibit 2, but which the ALJ declined to admit into evidence in apparent reliance on OAR 471-040-0023(4), which requires a party to provide copies of proposed documentary evidence to opposing parties before a telephone hearing begins.¹ Audio Record at 4:25 to 6:40. However, claimant advised that he had emailed the documents to the employer’s attorney, Stephen Scott, before the hearing. Audio Record at 4:45. Indeed, the “To” line of claimant’s cover email bears that attorney’s email address. Accordingly, it was improper to exclude the documents for failure to serve the employer, since claimant served the documents on one of the employer’s attorneys (even if a different attorney from the same firm appeared at hearing), and service on the attorney agent is sufficient to serve on the employer principal.

¹ See OAR 471-040-0023(4) (August 1, 2004) (“Prior to commencement of an evidentiary hearing that is held by telephone, each party and the Department shall provide to all other parties and to the Department copies of documentary evidence that it will seek to introduce into the record.”).

Given that claimant satisfied the requirements of OAR 471-040-0023(4) and that the documents should not have been excluded by the ALJ, the documents are necessary to complete the record and are admitted as such pursuant to OAR 471-041-0090(1)(a). The additional evidence is being marked as EAB Exhibit 1, and a copy provided to the parties with this decision. Any party that objects to our admitting EAB Exhibit 1 must submit such objection to this office in writing, setting forth the basis of the objection in writing, within ten days of our mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless such objection is received and sustained, the exhibit will remain in the record.

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant submitted a written argument on March 31, 2026. EAB considered claimant's argument in reaching this decision.

The employer submitted a written argument on April 10, 2026. The employer's argument contained information that was not part of the hearing record and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond the employer's reasonable control prevented them from offering the information during the hearing. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090, EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing, as well as EAB Exhibit 1, which should not have been excluded from the hearing record. EAB considered the parts of the employer's argument that were based on the hearing record.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Wallace Steel Inc., employed claimant as an operations manager from 2019 until September 5, 2025. Although his work responsibilities fluctuated depending on business need, claimant's duties included, but were not limited to, repairing some equipment and keeping the employer's shop clean.

(2) Claimant lived in Washington state, while the employer's business was located in Oregon. When the employer hired claimant, claimant asked the employer's owner if the employer would treat claimant's tax status as being based in or connected to Washington, rather than Oregon. The owner stated that he would not do that, and the employer gave claimant Oregon tax status.

(3) In or around January 2023, the owner formed the view that claimant was failing to perform some of his job duties, such as maintaining tools, keeping the shop clean, or failing to answer questions from general contractors. However, claimant did not fail to perform such job duties.

(4) In the second calendar quarter of 2024, someone other than claimant changed claimant's tax status from Oregon to Washington.

(5) On June 16, 2025, the owner determined that one of the employer's work trucks needed to have one of its brakes repaired. Though claimant was a certified mechanic, the owner told claimant to have members of the employer's crew of ironworkers do the repair. Members of the crew performed the repair, with claimant supervising, including by asking if the crew had "torqued the brakes" and receiving affirmative answers. Transcript at 30. After the repair was completed, claimant visually inspected the brake. Thereafter, the foreman of the crew complained to claimant of the truck having brake noise. Claimant and the foreman met in the employer's shop. Claimant determined that a bolt was missing from the brake, repaired the brake, and gave the foreman a ride home.

(6) The owner believed that claimant's conduct regarding the brake repair had created a safety issue and was an example of claimant failing to perform job duties. The owner believed that claimant had been responsible to repair the brake himself, but assigned the ironworkers to do the job, then failed to inspect the repair job they did, and did not take action for several days after the foreman complained about the brake.

(7) On July 7, 2025, the owner had a phone call with claimant about a job that would probably require claimant to work on a Saturday. The owner believed that claimant addressed him angrily and stated, "What the [fuck] does that mean for me?" Transcript at 8. However, during his employment, claimant did not speak to the owner in a harsh or escalated manner, did not direct foul language at him, and worked on weekends when asked to do so.

(8) The owner decided that discharging claimant was warranted based on what he had perceived as claimant addressing him angrily and using foul language on July 7, 2025. However, the owner determined that discharging claimant would cause him to have more work, so the employer did not take immediate action to discharge claimant.

(9) On or about early August 2025, the employer became aware that, in the second calendar quarter of 2024, someone had changed claimant's tax status from Oregon to Washington. The employer believed that claimant, who at some point before August 2025 had begun processing payroll for the employer, was responsible for making the change.

(10) On September 5, 2025, the employer discharged claimant. The employer believed that the brake repair issue and the change of claimant's tax status had caused the matter of whether to discharge claimant to "[come] to a head," and determined that discharge was warranted based on those issues as well as claimant's alleged conduct on July 7, 2025. Transcript at 7.

(11) Claimant was surprised when he was discharged on September 5, 2025. At that time, he received separation paperwork from the employer that cited as reasons for the discharge claimant's tax status change and allegedly failing in job duties due to being responsible for the truck's brake failure.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: The employer discharged claimant, but not 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).

The order under review concluded that the proximate cause of claimant's discharge was claimant's use of foul language during an alleged July 7, 2025 phone call with the owner. Order No. 26-UI-321695 at 3. Although in his testimony claimant disputed that he had directed foul language at the owner, and the burden of proof in a discharge matter is on the employer, the order contended that claimant's testimony regarding other events was "internally. . . inconsistent," and so found facts on all disputed issues in accordance with the employer's owner's account. Order No. 26-UI-321695 at 3. The order concluded that claimant's conduct during the July 7, 2025 phone call was misconduct. Order No. 26-UI-321695 at 3. The record does not support the order's conclusions or the order's decision to favor the owner's testimony over that of claimant on disputed issues of fact.

First, it was not appropriate for the order to reverse the burden of proof in this case and favor the owner's testimony over that of claimant. The order stated that it found the owner's testimony to be more persuasive because "claimant provided internally-inconsistent testimony[,] first that he had received no coaching, warnings, or reprimands, then that he was verbally reprimanded for incorrectly completing tasks for which he had not received the proper training." Order No. 26-UI-321695 at 3. This assertion is incorrect. In fact, claimant repeatedly and consistently testified that he had never received a disciplinary write-up during his employment. Transcript at 21, 22, 23, 31. As for any verbal reprimands, claimant stated, in reference to an allegation that he had sat at his desk and did nothing on a particular date, that he was "[n]ever talked to about this." Transcript at 31. Claimant's only reference in testimony to anything expressed verbally to him by the owner was to state that his job duties were not written down, but were "verbally expressed and constantly changing." Transcript at 24. Thus, the record does not support that claimant testified inconsistently about warnings received, and to the extent the order's making of that unsupported point was an explicit credibility determination adverse to claimant, EAB rejects the credibility determination.²

Second, with respect to the proximate cause of the discharge, the record offers a murky picture as to what alleged conduct on claimant's part caused the employer to actually discharge him when they did. At hearing, the owner testified that he discharged claimant on September 5, 2025, but that he made the decision to discharge "[r]ight around" July 7, 2025 after having a "heated discussion" on the phone with claimant on that date, where claimant "blew up" at the owner and "[c]ussed a little bit." Transcript at 6. However, the owner further testified that claimant's position was hard to fill and that discharging claimant would cause him to have more work. Transcript at 7. The owner then cited the work truck's brake repair issue and the changing of claimant's tax status from Oregon to Washington as factors that caused the matter to "[come] to a head" and led the owner to discharge claimant. Transcript at 7. For his part, claimant testified that, when he was discharged, it was "news to [him]," but that the separation paperwork he received from the employer cited the tax status change and failing in job duties relating to the brake failure as reasons for the discharge. Transcript at 21. It is therefore necessary to address each of these various reasons for the discharge.

As to the alleged July 7, 2025 phone conversation, the employer did not meet their burden to prove that that claimant's conduct during the alleged call amounted to misconduct. The owner testified that on that

² See ORS 657.275(2) ("When there is evidence in the record both to make more probable and less probable the existence of any basic fact or inference, the board need not explain its decision to believe or rely on such evidence unless the administrative law judge has made an explicit credibility determination regarding the source of such facts or evidence.").

date, he called claimant and told him that a crew needed to go to a certain location and that claimant would probably have to work that Saturday. Transcript at 8. The owner stated that claimant became angry and responded, “What the [fuck] does that mean for me?” after which the owner “just moved on” and arranged for a crew to handle the work without claimant being present. Transcript at 8.

Claimant rebutted this testimony. Claimant testified that he never directed foul language at the owner or spoke to him in an escalated manner, and that he did not recall a phone conversation with the owner on July 7, 2025. Transcript at 21. Claimant also testified that he worked weekends for the employer when he was asked to do so. Transcript at 32. As the accounts of the employer and claimant regarding the July 7, 2025 phone conversation are conflicting and no more than equally balanced, and given that the employer has the burden of proof, the employer did not meet their burden to prove that claimant’s conduct during the alleged call amounted to misconduct. As to these disputed points, the facts of this decision have been found in accordance with claimant’s account.³

Next, as to the matter of the repair of the work truck’s brake, the record casts doubt that the incident factored in to the employer’s decision to discharge claimant, given that the incident occurred on June 16, 2025, but the owner testified that he decided to discharge claimant after that, on July 7, 2025, and then the discharge did not actually take place until September 5, 2025. Transcript at 6. In any event, the employer did not meet their burden to prove that claimant’s conduct relating to the brake constituted misconduct.

At hearing, the owner testified that he determined that the work truck needed to have its brake repaired, and that it was claimant’s responsibility to do the repair job, as claimant was a certified mechanic and previously worked at a car dealership. Transcript at 11, 18. The owner testified that claimant had improperly assigned the owner’s “guys,” a crew of ironworkers, to do the repair, rather than to repair the brake himself. Transcript at 11. The owner testified that he had heard from an employee that claimant did not inspect the brake after the ironworkers repaired it. Transcript at 18. The owner testified that the crew’s foreman told the owner that he had told claimant that the brake did not sound right when he drove it, but that claimant took no action, and the brake caliper eventually fell off, creating a potential safety issue. Transcript at 12, 18-19.

Claimant rebutted this testimony. Claimant testified that the owner had told him to have the crew of ironworkers do the repair job. Transcript at 25, 30. Claimant testified that he supervised the crew, including by asking if the crew had “torqued the brakes” and receiving affirmative answers, and visually inspected the brake repair job when they were finished. Transcript at 30. Claimant testified that he met with the foreman at the employer’s shop to look at the brakes after the foreman mentioned brake noise, and that there was a bolt missing, which he repaired, and afterward gave the foreman a ride home. Transcript at 28-30. As the accounts of the employer and claimant regarding repair of the brake are in equal balance, and aspects of the employer’s account are based on hearsay (which is entitled to less

³ The employer similarly did not meet their burden as to a prior incident of a phone call involving an airport job, which the order under review cited as sufficient to conclude that the isolated instance of poor judgment doctrine was inapplicable in claimant’s circumstances. Order No. 26-UI-321695 at 4. The owner testified that this call occurred around January 2025, and asserted that claimant “scream[ed]” at him when he had asked claimant to go to a job at an airport. Transcript at 10, 36. Claimant testified that he never directed foul language at the owner or spoke to him in an escalated manner. Transcript at 21. Thus, the evidence on this disputed point is in equipoise and the employer did not meet their burden.

weight), the employer did not meet their burden to prove that claimant's conduct regarding repair of the brake was misconduct. As to these disputed points, the facts of this decision have been found in accordance with claimant's account.⁴

Finally, as to the change of claimant's tax status from Oregon to Washington, the employer also did not meet their burden to prove that claimant's conduct constituted misconduct. The record shows that claimant lived in Washington state, while the employer's business was located in Oregon. The owner testified that when he hired claimant in 2019, claimant asked for the employer to treat his tax status as being based in or connected to Washington, rather than Oregon, but the owner stated that he would not do that, and the employer gave claimant Oregon tax status. Transcript at 5. The owner suggested that the reason for the request was so claimant could avoid having to "pay Oregon taxes," perhaps a reference to state income tax, a type of tax that Oregon imposes but which Washington does not. Transcript at 5. The owner testified that among claimant's job duties, claimant was responsible for payroll and that in the second quarter of 2024, claimant changed his tax status from Oregon to Washington without the owner's knowledge. Transcript at 13, 14, 6.

Documentary evidence suggests that the employer became aware of the tax status change on or about August 5, 2025 and commenced an email discussion with their payroll tax administrator about the matter. *See* Exhibit 1 at 4. The email discussion focused on the unemployment insurance tax consequences of the change to claimant's tax status, rather than state income tax. Exhibit 1 at 2. The email discussion assumes the tax status change was made by claimant, but does not contain any evidence to support that contention. *See* Exhibit 1 at 2.

For his part, although he did not rebut the owner's testimony that he had asked to be given Washington tax status at hire, claimant specifically testified that he did not change his tax status from Oregon to Washington in 2024. Transcript at 22. Further, claimant testified that the employer had hired a bookkeeper to do payroll in 2024, and suggested that that individual may have been responsible for changing his tax status. Transcript at 22. Additionally, claimant was asked by the employer's counsel whether he had ever asked the owner's secretary to change his payroll status and claimant answered in the negative. Transcript at 27. Claimant also testified that he did not recall if he had access to the employer's payroll processing software in the second quarter of 2024, and stated that he started processing payroll after the departure of the bookkeeper that he asserted the employer had hired in 2024 to do payroll.

When this evidence is considered in combination, the record shows that claimant expressed interest to the owner of being treated as having Washington tax status at hire in 2019, and that claimant's tax status was changed from Oregon to Washington in the second quarter of 2024, but it is unclear whether claimant had access to the employer's payroll processing software at that time, and the employer did not show it was more likely than not that claimant made the tax status change, as opposed to someone else,

⁴ The brake repair issue appeared to be the most prominent of a group of examples, raised by the owner at hearing, of claimant allegedly failing to perform job duties. The owner testified that beginning around January 2023, he noticed that some of claimant's duties were not being performed, including maintaining tools, keeping the shop clean, and claimant telling general contractors to contact the owner with questions, instead of answering them himself. Transcript at 15, 9. To the extent that any of these issues factored into the decision to discharge claimant, the employer did not meet their burden to prove misconduct. At hearing, claimant generally denied knowledge of any incidents of failing to perform job duties, and specifically testified that he did not recall telling general contractors to contact the owner with questions. Transcript at 23, 32-33. Claimant also testified that his job duties were "verbally expressed and constantly changing" and that nothing was "solidly written" regarding them. Transcript at 24-25.

such as the bookkeeper claimant alleged was hired in 2024. As such, the employer failed to meet their burden to prove that claimant's conduct relating to the tax status change amounted to misconduct because the employer did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that claimant was the person who changed his tax status from Oregon to Washington.

Accordingly, as the above discussion outlines in detail, none of the various reasons advanced by the employer for why they discharged claimant on September 5, 2025 were shown to have constituted misconduct. The record therefore shows that the employer discharged claimant, but not for misconduct, and claimant is not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on the work separation.

DECISION: Order No. 26-UI-321695 is set aside, as outlined above.

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

DATE of Service: April 30, 2026

NOTE: This decision reverses the ALJ's order denying claimant benefits. Please note that in most cases, payment of benefits owed will take about a week for the Department to complete.

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 ໄດ້ ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄໍາແນະນໍາທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄໍາຕັດສິນນີ້.

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 الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار.

Farsi

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از 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.