EO: Intrastate
BYE: 20-Mar-2027

State of Oregon
Employment Appeals Board
875 Union St. N.E.
Salem, OR 97311

354
DS 005.00

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2026-EAB-0816

Reversed
Disqualification

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On June 18, 2026, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was discharged by the employer, but not for misconduct, and was therefore not disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits based on the discharge (decision # L0018272336). The employer filed a timely request for hearing. On August 6, 2026, ALJ Bender conducted a hearing, and on August 14, 2026 issued Order No. 26-UI-337479, affirming decision # L0018272336. On September 3, 2026, the employer filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant's argument and the employer's September 3 and 22, 2026 arguments contained information that was not part of the hearing record and did not show that factors or circumstances beyond each party's reasonable control prevented them from offering the information during the hearing. Under ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090 (May 13, 2019), EAB considered only information received into evidence at the hearing. EAB considered any parts of the three arguments that were based on the hearing record.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) Wildflower Play Collective employed claimant as their executive director from 2023 through March 24, 2026. Claimant was involved in the nonprofit organization's founding and served as a volunteer prior to becoming executive director. Until March 2026, the employer's board generally conducted business informally and made decisions by consensus.

(2) On March 9, 2026, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the board, a change to the makeup of the board occurred, and the board voted to begin observing the formalities of governance in accordance with the organization's existing bylaws, including by having officers stand for election. The position of executive director was one of the officer positions set to be filled by election, and claimant was invited to nominate herself and stand for election if she wished to remain in her position. Others in the organization also planned to nominate themselves for the position. The election was originally scheduled to be held at a March 16, 2026 board meeting, but, at claimant's request on March 11, 2026, was postponed to March 21, 2026.

(3) Claimant viewed the actions of the board in resolving to fill the executive director position by election as illegitimate and ill-advised. In a written message to the board on March 15, 2026, claimant described the situation as "an elaborate coup" that was "dishonest and insulting." Exhibit 1 at 3. The board replied that claimant misunderstood their intentions and that it was not an effort designed to remove her from her position.

(4) The employer's general email had an address that was [a variation of the organization name]@gmail.com, and the employer used a Google Drive account where the organization's files were stored. Only claimant and the employer's operations manager had the password to log into the email and Google Drive accounts. On March 18, 2026, the operations manager discovered that claimant had changed the password to this account, and that the employer could therefore no longer access their files stored there.

(5) Also on March 18, 2026, an email recently sent from claimant to one of the employer's vendors was discovered. The email stated, "My staff person and board have initiated ousting me as [executive director] and I'm afraid they are going to destroy the nonprofit by running out of funds. If we go out of business can we break the contract with [the vendor]?" Exhibit 1 at 6. The operations manager also discovered an email that day from the employer's bank stating that the employer's account password had been changed, and upon trying to log into the bank account, the operations manager confirmed that claimant had changed the password so that the employer no longer had access to the account.

(6) Following these discoveries, the board convened an emergency meeting in the evening of March 18, 2026 and resolved to send a written message to claimant directing her to, within 24 hours, provide the current passwords to the general email, Google Drive, and bank accounts, among others; and to not communicate with "vendors, partners, or external parties" or engage in "any financial transactions" without specific authorization. Exhibit 1 at 7. The message was sent to claimant the following day.

(7) On March 19, 2026, in response to the board's message, claimant wrote:

> I want [the organization] to continue, so that in the best interest of that goal I'm going to provide a handoff folder with everything I hold knowledge to and how to move forward. I'm going to write down everything I have been working on, where everything is, what payments are due. I will provide a list of contacts, passwords, handover full control of the Google Drive and Bank account. I will remove my affiliation from the official documents, accounts, and bank account. I will provide handover to the bookkeeper and tell her how to remove me from payroll. You will put into the meeting minutes next Tuesday that I am fired for no cause of my own and email these minutes in a letter that says the same. You will agree in these minutes and letter to continue paying the SBA loan in my name and completely pay off the SBA debt in full in case of liquidating [the organization's] assets, including the program.[1] You will provide these amendments letter by March 26th. This transition of my role in transmitter of data will be completed by

[1] The record suggests that the employer believed claimant had violated their expectations regarding her involvement with this loan and its servicing, but that at the time she was discharged the employer was uncertain as to many of the details that would later lead them to form that belief. More likely than not, the loan was not a proximate cause of the employer's decision to discharge claimant, and is therefore only mentioned in this decision where necessary to provide context to other relevant actions of the parties.

> March 31st. As of March 31st, I will no longer be a member of this board or part of any committees.

Transcript at 18-19. In response, the board held another emergency meeting that day and resolved to send a message to claimant acknowledging her demands, notifying her that the board had "removed [her] from all operational authority" and stating, "You are no longer authorized to act on behalf of [the employer], including communications, financial activity, or vendor engagement," and that they were still awaiting access to documents and accounts. Exhibit 1 at 11. The message was sent to claimant that day.

(8) Later on March 19, 2026, after claimant read the employer's message, she made a public post on the employer's Facebook page that stated, in relevant part:

> I never thought I would pour 7 years of my life into launching and building something for my community only to have it stolen from me by two of those same women. . . I have been removed as Executive Director in a hostile, deceitful way and I am heartbroken and appalled! There was no conversation, no respect for the work that I have done to create [the organization]. Just lies, backstabbing and gaslighting.

Exhibit 1 at 11. The operations manager was able to remove the post after it was brought to her attention. Claimant reposted the message in another public Facebook group concerning local affairs, and it was removed the following day. The posts caused the employer to receive several negative comments and reviews. The parties continued to correspond by email regarding their respective demands through March 21, 2026.

(9) On March 20, 2026, through working directly with their bank in person, the employer was able to remove claimant as an authorized user of the employer's account and "regain. . . some amount of financial control[.]" Transcript at 26.

(10) In the evening of March 21, 2026, the board held the rescheduled meeting to elect officers, which claimant did not attend despite being permitted to do so. A different candidate was nominated and elected to the executive director position.

(11) On March 24, 2026, the board met and resolved to discharge claimant from the executive director position with immediate effect. On March 26, 2026, a letter was sent to claimant informing her of the discharge and again directing her to transfer control over email, communication, financial, vendor, and file storage accounts to the employer. Claimant was paid as if she had worked through March 31, 2026.

(12) On March 29, 2026, claimant sent a message to the board, stating that after consultation with legal counsel she was "prepared to transfer administrative access, credentials, and files," but that this was contingent on the employer signing an agreement releasing her from all claims. Exhibit 1 at 25.

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant was discharged for misconduct.

Nature of the Work Separation. A work separation occurs when a claimant or employer ends the employer-employee relationship. If claimant could have continued to work for the employer for an additional period of time, the work separation is a voluntary leaving. OAR 471-030-0038(2)(a)

(September 22, 2020). If claimant was willing to continue working for the employer for an additional period of time, but the employer did not allow claimant to do so, the separation is a discharge. OAR 471-030-0038(2)(b).

The events leading to claimant's separation began on March 9, 2026, when the board resolved to hold elections for officer positions, including the one held by claimant. Claimant could potentially have retained her position by standing for election, and the employer had not given notice of an intent to discharge her at that time. However, in response to the board's action, claimant restricted the employer's access to their accounts and files and refused to restore it, leading the employer to indefinitely suspend claimant from performing work duties beginning in the evening of March 18, 2026. On March 19, 2026, claimant sent a message to the employer stating that she would fully restore the employer's access to their accounts and files and cooperate with a transition out of her role that would be completed by March 31, 2026, if the employer complied with certain conditions, including deeming her to have been discharged without cause. This did not necessarily demonstrate an unwillingness by claimant to continue working for the employer after March 31, 2026, however, as claimant merely invited the employer to discharge her and did not unequivocally state that she intended to stop working at that time. The employer did not discharge claimant at that time, and claimant instead remained indefinitely suspended from work.

Thereafter, the employer learned that claimant had recently sent an email disparaging them and their financial condition to a vendor; and that on March 19, 2026, claimant had posted public social media messages disparaging the employer. Claimant also continued to refuse to restore full access to the employer's accounts and files unless the employer met her conditions. On March 21, 2026, a new executive director was elected to replace claimant. On March 24, 2026, the employer resolved to discharge claimant but pay her the equivalent of her wages through March 31, 2026. It was only at that point, on March 24, 2026, that the employer became unwilling to continue in the employment relationship. By contrast, it can be inferred that claimant had been willing to continue in the relationship for at least some additional period of time, even if only for the purpose of attempting to negotiate the terms of her separation. Accordingly, the work separation was a discharge that occurred on March 24, 2026.

Discharge. ORS 657.176(2)(a) requires a disqualification from unemployment insurance benefits if the employer discharged claimant for misconduct connected with work. "As used in ORS 657.176(2)(a) . . . a willful or wantonly negligent violation of the standards of behavior which an employer has the right to expect of an employee is misconduct. An act or series of actions that amount to a willful or wantonly negligent disregard of an employer's interest is misconduct." OAR 471-030-0038(3)(a). "'[W]antonly negligent' means indifference to the consequences of an act or series of actions, or a failure to act or a series of failures to act, where the individual acting or failing to act is conscious of his or her conduct and knew or should have known that his or her conduct would probably result in a violation of the standards of behavior which an employer has the right to expect of an employee." OAR 471-030-0038(1)(c). In a discharge case, the employer has the burden to establish misconduct by a preponderance of evidence. *Babcock v. Employment Division*, 25 Or App 661, 550 P2d 1233 (1976).

Isolated instances of poor judgment are not misconduct. OAR 471-030-0038(3)(b). To be isolated, an instance of poor judgment must be a single or infrequent occurrence rather than a repeated act or pattern of other willful or wantonly negligent behavior. OAR 471-030-0038(1)(d)(A). However, acts that

violate the law, that are tantamount to unlawful conduct, or 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)(D).

The employer discharged claimant for her actions following the March 9, 2026 board meeting, particularly her removal of the employer's access to their accounts and files, and refusing to fully restore the access unless conditions were met, as well as making disparaging statements to a vendor and the public about the employer. Claimant's actions regarding the accounts and files were first discovered by the employer on March 18, 2026, and she was directed to fully restore access within a day, but, as of March 24, 2026, had not complied. Claimant therefore knew or should have known of the employer's expectations in that regard since at least March 19, 2026. Additionally, it can reasonably be inferred that the employer expected their employees not to disparage them to vendors or the public, and, as a standard of behavior that an employer typically expects of their employees, claimant's understanding of that expectation can be inferred. Clamant was also specifically directed not to communicate with "external parties" on March 19, 2026, prior to her social media posts that day.

The order under review concluded that the employer failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence that claimant violated a reasonable expectation by continuously preventing the employer from accessing their accounts and files; and that, due to her "heightened emotions" over being suspended from her position earlier in the day, she did not act willfully or with wanton negligence in making the social media posts disparaging the employer. Order No. 26-UI-337479 at 3. The record does not support these conclusions.

The record shows that prior to March 11, 2026, the employer had access to their general email account, the Google Drive account in which their files were stored, and their bank account, among others. The employer asserted that by March 18, 2026, claimant had changed the passwords to each of these accounts and had refused to give the new passwords to the employer through at least March 24, 2026, when she was discharged. Claimant did not rebut this assertion at hearing but explained why she felt that her actions were justified. Regarding the employer's general email account, which also served as the login to the Google Drive account, claimant essentially asserted at hearing that she viewed at least some of the emails associated with the account as hers personally, despite those emails having been sent or received in her capacity as executive director; that she viewed the employer's access to the emails as "spy[ing] on" her; and that she needed to maintain personal access to the account to correspond with the government about the SBA loan for which she may have been a personal guarantor. Transcript at 46.

In documentary evidence, claimant referred to the accounts as "my own [employer] email and Google Drive" accounts, and asserted that changing their passwords was a "reasonable act of self-protection." Exhibit 2 at 14. This suggests that claimant may have mistakenly viewed her role in the creation or primary use of the accounts as conferring personal, rather than organizational, ownership of them. However, the account was, more likely than not, created for the organization's use and remained the employer's property through any change in the holder of the executive director position. An employer generally has the right to access any of their email accounts, even if assigned to or used primarily or exclusively by an individual employee. The employer's directive that claimant immediately restore access to the email account was therefore reasonable, despite claimant's perceived justification for believing otherwise.

Similarly, claimant's withholding of that login prevented the employer from accessing their files in the associated Google Drive account. Claimant explained at hearing that in response to the employer's directive to restore access to the Google Drive, she created a folder in which she placed only the files she believed the employer should have access to, and granted the employer access to that folder rather than the full account. Transcript at 43-44. When the employer responded on March 19, 2026 that this was unacceptable and reiterated that full access to the account must be restored, claimant replied that she would do so only if certain demands were met. Transcript at 18-19. Claimant testified that she did not restore full access after March 19, 2026 because the employer did not meet those demands. Transcript at 49. Claimant's March 29, 2026 offer to restore access to the accounts further supports that claimant had the ability to comply with the employer's directives through the time of her discharge on March 24, 2026, but that she willfully chose not to do so.

Regarding the employer's March 18, 2026 discovery that claimant had recently changed the password to the employer's bank account login, claimant testified that she had changed the password because the login for the employer's account had recently and inexplicably been linked to her personal account at the same bank, and she did not want to the employer to have access to her personal account. Transcript at 46-47. Claimant testified that upon discovering the linked accounts and changing the employer's password, she "asked [the bank] to fix it and they. . . did." Transcript at 47. Claimant also offered as evidence at hearing a written message purportedly from a bank employee. The message stated that on March 17, 2026, the bank employee was asked to resolve an issue with the accounts being linked and that the employee "reached out to [claimant] and was able to remove access to the business account." Exhibit 2 at 11. The message also stated, "There was no way that [claimant] could have linked these accounts on her own behalf." Exhibit 2 at 11.[2] Therefore, according to the evidence presented by claimant, the account unlinking occurred on March 17, 2026. Claimant did not offer a further explanation for continuing to withhold the password to the employer's account through March 20, 2026, when the employer regained at least some access to the account on their own by visiting the bank in person and removing claimant as an authorized user.

As with the Google accounts, claimant's March 19, 2026 offer to immediately provide the employer with access to their banking password if her demands were met demonstrated that she had the ability at that time to comply with the employer's directive to supply the password, and that she willfully chose not to do so. The record does not show that the employer's directives to immediately restore access to the bank account, or the Google accounts, were unreasonable.[3]

Next, at some point between March 9 and 18, 2026, claimant sent a message to one of the employer's vendors stating that others were "ousting" her from her position, suggesting that this could "destroy the nonprofit by running out of funds," and questioning whether the employer could break their contract with the vendor if the employer went out of business. The employer discovered this message on March 18, 2026. Claimant asserted that this message was "[o]rdinary, responsible vendor communication during a leadership transition" that should not be viewed as misconduct. Exhibit 2 at 14. However, disparaging the employer's decisions and financial condition to a vendor and suggesting to the vendor

[2] The employer provided rebuttal evidence, testifying that they were told by the bank "that linking accounts required an affirmative request," but the employer was unsure whether the unlinking of accounts occurred during the employer's March 20, 2026 bank visit or at some other time. Transcript at 66-67.

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

that the employer might breach their contract cannot objectively be viewed as "responsible" or in furtherance of the employer's interest. It can reasonably be inferred that claimant acted with at least indifference to the consequences of her actions, if not willful disregard of the employer's interest, and knew or should have known that her actions would probably result in a violation of a standard of behavior that an employer has the right to expect of an employee. As such, claimant violated a reasonable employer expectation with at least wanton negligence regarding this incident.

Finally, on March 19, 2026, claimant posted a social media message in two public groups, one of which belonged to the employer, stating that she had been "removed as Executive Director in a hostile, deceitful way" and accusing those allegedly responsible for this of "lies, backstabbing and gaslighting." Prior to posting this message to both groups, the employer had suspended claimant from all work responsibilities and directed her not to communicate with external parties without authorization. In hearing documents, claimant described her actions in writing and posting this message as a "lapse in judgment" made due to "emotional distress." Exhibit 2 at 15. However, it is reasonable to infer that claimant acted consciously in typing and posting the message in two locations, and that she did so with indifference to the consequences of her actions, knowing that they would probably result in a violation of the employer's expectations. As such, claimant acted with at least wanton negligence. Therefore, with respect to each of these incidents comprising the proximate cause of claimant's discharge, claimant acted willfully or with wanton negligence in violating the employer's expectations.[4]

Claimant asserted that her conduct, at least with respect to the March 19, 2026 social media postings, should be excused as an isolated instance of poor judgment, which is not misconduct. Exhibit 2 at 15. However, to be "isolated," an instance of poor judgment must be a single or infrequent occurrence rather than a repeated act or pattern of other willful or wantonly negligent behavior. For the reasons previously indicated, the record shows that claimant acted willfully or with wanton negligence in refusing to immediately restore the employer's access to their email, Google Drive, and bank accounts; in her message to the vendor; and in her two social media postings. The conduct for which claimant was discharged therefore cannot be considered a single or infrequent occurrence, and was therefore not "isolated." Moreover, claimant's public disparagement of the employer and the ongoing nature of her refusal to fully restore the employer's access to their accounts and files would cause a reasonable employer in the same situation to conclude that a continuing employment relationship was impossible, and her actions therefore exceeded mere poor judgment.[5] Accordingly, claimant's actions cannot be excused as an isolated instance of poor judgment, and her discharge was for misconduct.

---

[4] *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). The employer's decision to discharge claimant on March 24, 2026 was, more likely than not, due to the cumulative effect of these incidents that occurred, continued, or were discovered during claimant's suspension from work.

[5] *See Callaway v. Employment Dept.*, 225 Or App 650, 202 P3d 196 (2009) (a determination of whether a claimant's conduct caused a breach of trust is objective, not subjective, and the employer cannot unilaterally announce a breach of trust if a reasonable employer in the same situation would not); *Freeman v. Employment Dept.,* 195 Or App 417, 98 P3d 402 (2004) (the isolated instance of poor judgment analysis "logically involves an examination of the claimant's decision making process that led to the consequences, as well as the nature or gravity of the conduct or consequence itself").

For these reasons, claimant was discharged for misconduct and is disqualified from receiving benefits effective March 22, 2026.

DECISION: Order No. 26-UI-337479 is set aside, as outlined above.

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

DATE of Service: October 20, 2026

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 – 本判决会影响您的失业救济金。 如果您不明白本判决， 请立即联系就业上诉委员会。 如果您不同意此判决，您可以按照该判决结尾所写的说明，向俄勒冈州上诉法院提出司法复审申请。

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 فورا، 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 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.