EO: Intrastate
BYE: 08-May-2027

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

019
VQ 005.00

# EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
# 2026-EAB-0836

*Affirmed*
*Disqualification*

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On July 10, 2026, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause and therefore was disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective May 10, 2026 to May 8, 2027 (decision # L0018694426). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On August 13, 2026, ALJ Monroe conducted a hearing, and on August 21, 2026, issued Order No. 26-UI-337987,[1] modifying decision # L0018694426 by concluding that claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause and therefore was disqualified effective May 10, 2026 and until requalified. On September 8, 2026, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

**WRITTEN ARGUMENT:** Claimant and the employer each submitted written arguments. EAB considered those arguments in reaching this decision.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** (1) The Oregon Shakespearean Festival Association employed claimant as a lead electrician from August 6, 2024 until May 13, 2026. The employer was a repertory theater company that produced plays and musicals. Claimant's job required him to work on the employer's lighting systems and lighting designs, and sometimes involved climbing ladders or working at heights.

(2) Claimant had a long-term medical condition stemming from a military service-connected injury to his left shoulder.

[1] Although Order No. 26-UI-337987 stated that Exhibits A through E, offered by claimant, were admitted into evidence, claimant in fact submitted those exhibits plus several more, Exhibits F through M, all of which were marked by the ALJ and admitted into the hearing record. As such, the order's reference to only Exhibits A through E is presumed to be a typographical error and the order is presumed to have meant to have stated that Exhibits A through M were offered by claimant and admitted into the record.

(3) During his employment, claimant developed several points of dissatisfaction with his supervisor, the employer's lighting department manager. On two occasions during claimant's employment, once in October 2024, and again in early 2025, claimant applied for a lighting supervisor job with the employer, but was not interviewed or hired for that job. Claimant blamed the lighting department manager for not being interviewed or hired for the job.

(4) In early 2025, an incident occurred in which the lighting department manager raised her voice at claimant while in the presence of other employees. The employer placed the lighting department manager on administrative leave and investigated the incident, then disciplined the lighting department manager and required her to take additional training. Thereafter, the lighting department manager returned to work in the same capacity, supervising claimant and others.

(5) Among other things, claimant felt that the lighting department manager did not give him proper guidance, ignored him, was absent too often, was paid too much, and that claimant was subjected to wage theft by omission for not getting supervisor's pay when he had work scheduling permissions while the lighting department manager was on vacation. Claimant also disagreed with some of the changes to equipment that the lighting department manager made. On an occasion before August 2025, while claimant and others were working together at night, cueing lights on a stage, the lighting department manager drank alcohol with a lighting designer in claimant's presence. In August 2025, claimant prepared and submitted to the employer a lengthy written statement documenting the above points of dissatisfaction with the lighting department manager. *See* Exhibit J at 1-13.

(6) On August 8, 2025, claimant sent the employer an email asserting, among other things, that the lighting department manager's scheduling practices had prevented him from taking rest breaks, and that he had used a "[G]enie lift" to correct an issue on a particular stage but later heard from another employee that the lighting department manager did not consider the lift safe to use on that stage. Exhibit K at 2.

(7) The employer investigated the issues raised in claimant's August 2025 communications. The employer adopted a safety policy prohibiting the Genie lift from being used on that particular stage, but did not specifically inform claimant of the new policy. They also determined that some of claimant's complaints, such as the allegation that the lighting department manager prevented claimant from taking his breaks, lacked merit and were not made in good faith. As a result, the employer gave claimant a verbal warning. Exhibit M at 3.

(8) In September 2025, the lighting department manager informed claimant that due to budgetary cutbacks, the lighting department was to have one of its lead electrician jobs eliminated for the 2026 theater season, and the employer would only have an assistant lead electrician job to offer him for 2026. Exhibit D at 1. However, prior to the start of the 2026 season, claimant's co-lead electrician resigned, and claimant was retained as lead electrician for the 2026 season.

(9) In January 2026, claimant and the lighting department manager got into an argument in which claimant complained of being excluded from information regarding the hiring of an assistant lead electrician, the manager angrily told him that he needed to "act a different way" and "do what she said," and claimant accused the manager of not being truthful to executive leadership. Transcript at 59.

(10) The last day claimant worked for the employer was February 7, 2026. On February 9, 2026, claimant sent an email to the employer's executive director stating that "continued employment through the remainder of [his] contract d[id] not feel workable" and requesting that the employer enter into a mutual separation agreement and place him on paid administrative leave while the parties negotiated the agreement. Exhibit 1 at 3. The employer agreed to place claimant on a two-week paid administrative leave while the parties considered separation agreement proposals, and later extended this leave an additional two weeks.

(11) On or around March 9, 2026, the employer sent claimant a draft separation agreement that, if agreed to, would call for claimant's employment to end on March 18, 2026, but stated that claimant otherwise was expected to return to work on March 10, 2026. Claimant did not agree to the proposed separation agreement.

(12) On March 10, 2026, claimant was diagnosed with anxiety and adjustment disorder with suicidal ideation. Claimant had begun having symptoms of the condition in December 2024. On March 10, 2026, claimant gave the employer a letter from his medical provider stating that he was under their medical care and was excused from work from March 10, 2026 through April 3, 2026. Exhibit 2 at 2. In response, the employer provided claimant with Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) forms, and information on how to make a claim under their Paid Leave Oregon equivalent plan, which was managed by a third-party administrator.

(13) After receipt of the March 10, 2026 letter, the employer designated claimant as on protected medical leave. Claimant used his sick leave balance to cover his pay through most of March 2026. Claimant applied for the Paid Leave Oregon equivalent plan, and the employer advanced claimant's pay to him while the claim was under review from March 30 to April 4, 2026.

(14) On April 4, 2026, the employer emailed claimant that they understood he had not yet provided required medical certification for the paid leave claim and that they would stop advancing his pay while the paid leave claim was pending. The employer also stated, "When you are ready to return to work, please have your provider outline any specific restrictions or limitations. We will review that information at that time and work with you through the interactive process to determine what accommodations may be appropriate." Exhibit 3 at 3.

(15) On April 6, 2026, claimant gave the employer an FMLA certification filled out by his provider concluding that claimant had a serious health condition that would prevent him from performing the essential job function of "climbing, avoid heights." Exhibit 3 at 9. The form stated that claimant "has weekly treatment plan established" that was "weekly for the first 6 weeks; plan will be adjusted" and estimated to end "09/30/26" and that claimant will be referred to another provider for mental health evaluation or treatment. Exhibit 3 at 8.

(16) On April 7, 2026, the employer took claimant off their work schedule and removed his access to the schedule. On April 7, 2026, the employer's HR director emailed claimant and confirmed receipt of the FMLA certification, stated that they were reviewing what restrictions could be accommodated, and that it might be necessary to ask claimant's provider clarifying questions regarding his work capacity and restrictions. On April 10, 2026, the employer sent claimant a medical questionnaire for him to give to his

provider. Claimant conveyed the form to his provider, who faxed it back to the employer on April 16, 2026. When receiving the April 16, 2026 answers, the employer had no direct communication with the provider, other than the provider's office had called the employer requesting their fax number, which the employer gave to the provider's office.

(17) In the April 16, 2026 answers, the provider indicated that claimant was able to perform work in his job and that the climbing and working at heights restrictions were no longer applicable because claimant had had medication discontinued. Exhibit 3 at 19-20. The provider indicated that claimant was otherwise able to work a full schedule outside of the one day per week he needed to see the other provider for mental health treatment. Exhibit 3 at 20. The provider stated that claimant's restrictions were temporary and would require re-evaluation with the initial plan ending at the end of April 2026. Exhibit 3 at 21.

(18) On April 21, 2026, the employer's human resources (HR) director sent claimant an email referencing the April 16, 2026 medical provider answers. The employer stated that based on that information, claimant was able to work without limitation except for one day off per week to see a medical provider, which the employer was able to accommodate. The same day, claimant replied that he had a new medical provider, that the April 16, 2026 answers did not "reflect [his] current functional limitations[,]" and that the new provider would send updated documentation. Exhibit 3 at 23.

(19) Claimant conveyed the medical questionnaire form to the new provider. The new provider returned answers to the employer on April 23, 2026. The April 23, 2026 answers from the new medical provider differed from the earlier answers in that the April 23, 2026 answers specified that claimant was restricted from climbing and heights due to his left shoulder injury, provided detail as to how to carry out claimant's climbing and height restrictions, stated that the restrictions were ongoing pending treatment and another provider's recommendations, and stated that claimant was to be reevaluated on May 20, 2026. Exhibit 3 at 24-26.

(20) After receipt of the April 23, 2026 answers, the HR director conducted research and made a list of duties the employer could offer claimant that would enable him to work while honoring his shoulder injury restrictions. On May 4, 2026, the HR director sent claimant an email providing a range of dates that week for claimant to have a meeting to engage in an interactive process regarding workplace accommodations, and expressing an intention for claimant to return to work on May 12, 2026. Exhibit 4 at 3.

(21) On May 5, 2026, claimant sent the HR director an email requesting that interactive process communications occur by email rather than in a live meeting. On May 7, 2026, the HR director replied, stating that the employer's practice was to engage in an interactive live conversation. Exhibit 4 at 4.

(22) On or about May 9, 2026, the third-party administrator denied claimant's paid leave claim for insufficient medical documentation. On May 9, 2026, the HR director sent claimant an email, again urging claimant to engage in the interactive process. The HR director stated that she would be the only representative of the employer who would participate in the interactive process with claimant but that when claimant returned to work, he would continue to report to the lighting department manager. Exhibit 4 at 5-6. The HR director also stated that if claimant still preferred to engage in the interactive process by email, she would do so, with the understanding that live discussion may be needed at some point. Exhibit 4 at 5.

(23) On May 13, 2026, the HR director sent claimant an email again stating that the employer was prepared to engage in the interactive process for claimant to return to work with accommodations. The HR director stated that the employer was prepared to engage in the interactive process in writing, and noted that a live discussion may become helpful or necessary at some point. Exhibit 5 at 3.

(24) Shortly after midnight on May 14, 2026, claimant sent the employer an email with the subject line "FINAL NOTICE: Acceptance of Constructive Discharge and Formal Notice of Institutional Liability." Exhibit 5 at 4. In the email, claimant accused the employer of refusing to engage in the interactive process, and stated that he was not voluntarily resigning but that the "private interactive process is closed." Exhibit 5 at 4. Claimant also stated, "My employment with [the employer] is terminated effective today[.]" Exhibit C at 2. That day, the HR director sent claimant a reply email stating that they had begun claimant's off boarding and requesting that he return the employer's property in his possession. Exhibit 5 at 5.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS:** Claimant voluntarily left work without good cause.

**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 work separation was a voluntary leaving that occurred on May 14, 2026. On that date, claimant sent the employer an email with the subject line, "FINAL NOTICE: Acceptance of Constructive Discharge[2] and Formal Notice of Institutional Liability." Exhibit 5 at 4. Claimant also stated in the email, referencing the day the email was drafted, that, "My employment with [the employer] is terminated effective today, May 13, 2026." Exhibit C at 2. At hearing, claimant acknowledged that this email severed the employment relationship. Transcript at 8-9. When claimant sent the May 14, 2026 email, the employer had, for weeks, evidenced a consistent willingness to engage in the interactive process that would enable claimant to return to work with accommodations. Thus, claimant could have continued working for the employer for an additional period of time, but, as of May 14, 2026, was unwilling to do so. The work separation was therefore a voluntary leaving that occurred on May 14, 2026.

**Voluntary Leaving.** A claimant who leaves work voluntarily is disqualified from the receipt of benefits unless they prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that they had good cause for leaving work when they did. ORS 657.176(2)(c); *Young v. Employment Depart.*, 170 Or App 752, 13 P3d 1027 (2000). "Good cause . . . is such that a reasonable and prudent person of normal sensitivity, exercising ordinary

[2] Although claimant framed the work separation as a constructive discharge, that concept does not exist in the law of unemployment insurance and, in any event, the subjective characterizations of the parties are not controlling. Whether the work separation was a discharge or a voluntary leaving is a legal conclusion, based on facts in the record, not on the parties' characterizations. *See Roadhouse v. Employment Dept.*, 283 Or App 859, 863, 391 P.3d 887, 890 (Or. App. 2017) ("The answer to the threshold question of whether an employee has voluntarily left work or been discharged is a legal conclusion that is based on factual findings.") (Internal quotation marks removed).

common sense, would leave work." OAR 471-030-0038(4). "[T]he reason must be of such gravity that the individual has no reasonable alternative but to leave work." OAR 471-030-0038(4). The standard is objective. *McDowell v. Employment Depart.*, 348 Or 605, 612, 236 P3d 722 (2010). Claimant had an injured left shoulder, a permanent or long-term "physical or mental impairment" as defined at 29 CFR §1630.2(h). A claimant with an impairment who quits work must show that a reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with such an impairment would not have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time.

It is warranted to consider claimant's left shoulder injury to be a permanent or long-term impairment. This is so because claimant testified that it was a "veteran's service[-]connected disability," and therefore presumably was a longstanding condition dating from military service that took place before claimant started working for the employer. Transcript at 10. With respect to claimant's mental health difficulties, however, the record fails to show that they were long-term or permanent in nature. Claimant was diagnosed with anxiety and adjustment disorder with suicidal ideation on March 10, 2026, and had begun having symptoms in December 2024. The medical provider information in the record mostly concerned the shoulder injury, but called for mental health treatment one day per week for six weeks and then subject to re-evaluation or adjustment, with one source, the April 16, 2026 provider answers, suggesting that the one day per week mental health treatment restriction was temporary. Exhibit 3 at 21. Given that claimant's anxiety and adjustment disorder was diagnosed only a matter of about nine weeks before he quit work, and that symptoms had been present for less than 18 months at that time, coupled with documentation suggesting that claimant's provider may have considered claimant's mental health difficulties to be temporary, the record fails to show that claimant's mental health difficulties were permanent or long-term impairments. Accordingly, the applicable standard in this case is whether a reasonable and prudent person with the characteristics and qualities of an individual with claimant's shoulder injury would not have continued to work for their employer for an additional period of time.

At hearing, claimant raised numerous bases for voluntarily leaving work. None of these reasons, when considered individually or in combination, constituted good cause to quit work. First, claimant testified that he sent his May 14, 2026 email ending his employment because the employer had refused to engage in the interactive process to discuss workplace accommodations in writing and had taken him off from, and removed his access to, the work schedule as of April 7, 2026. Transcript at 5. Claimant also alleged that the employer had communicated directly with his medical providers after he had instructed them not to do so. Transcript at 7.

It is not clear that claimant was entitled to an interactive process that would have been exclusively in writing. In any event, the employer did ultimately state, more than once, that they were willing to conduct the process in writing. Exhibit 5 at 3. Claimant did not engage, instead sending his resignation email a few hours after the second occasion the employer offered to do the interactive process in writing. Exhibit 5 at 4. Claimant testified that he did not engage because of the HR director's mention in her May 13, 2026 email that "a live discussion may still become helpful or necessary at some point[.] Exhibit 5 at 3; Transcript at 54. The mere possibility that a live discussion would happen later did not provide a reasonable basis for claimant to refuse to participate. A reasonable person with claimant's shoulder injury would have engaged in the interactive process. Doing so would likely have been fruitful given the HR director's testimony that, after some research, she had made a list of duties the employer could offer claimant that would enable him to work while honoring his shoulder injury restrictions. Transcript at 51.

As for the employer taking claimant off the work schedule on April 7, 2026, the HR director credibly explained that this was done because claimant had been listed on the schedule since February 7, 2026 without working, but was on an open-ended medical leave of absence, so taking claimant off the schedule helped to maintain confidentiality by avoiding having other employees see claimant's name on the schedule and ask about claimant's status. Transcript at 33-34. Furthermore, contrary to claimant's assertions, the employer did not communicate directly with claimant's providers, other than to give a provider their fax number when requested. The record shows that claimant gave the employer's April 10, 2026 medical questionnaire to two separate providers, and that each of these providers independently directly returned their answers to the employer, one on April 16 and another on April 23, 2026, without the employer communicating directly with them, other than to give the fax number. Accordingly, claimant did not have good cause to quit work based on these reasons.

Next, claimant testified that he was in a "precarious economic situation" as of May 14, 2026, because he had been without a paycheck for five weeks and the equivalent plan administrator had denied his paid leave claim. Transcript at 7-8. In evaluating claimant's financial hardship, it should be noted that claimant initiated his status of being employer-attached without working when, on February 9, 2026, he asked the employer to begin discussions regarding a mutual separation agreement and to place him on paid administrative leave while the parties negotiated. Exhibit 1 at 2-3. While the mutual separation agreement never came to pass, the employer placed claimant on paid administrative leave for several weeks beginning February 9, 2026, claimant was able to use his sick leave balance to cover his pay through the remainder of March 2026, and the employer advanced claimant's pay to him while his Paid Leave Oregon equivalent plan claim was under review from March 30 until April 4, 2026. Thereafter, the claim remained pending without claimant's pay being advanced to him until May 8, 2026, when the administrator denied the claim.

Thus, though claimant received income replacement for the period in February and March 2026 that he did not work, he indeed had not been paid for several weeks as of May 14, 2026. However, rather than quit on that date, claimant could have engaged in the interactive accommodation process in writing, returned to work, and then resumed earning an income. Because a reasonable and prudent person with claimant's shoulder injury would have pursued this option instead of leaving work, claimant quit work without good cause to the extent he quit due to financial hardship.

Finally, claimant testified that at the time of his work separation, he continued to have "unresolved . . . workplace . . . concerns" and had been informed that he would continue to report to the lighting department manager if he returned to work. Transcript at 8. This suggests that claimant quit work because of his dissatisfaction with the lighting department manager. At hearing, the HR director confirmed that had claimant returned to work, he would have had to continue to work under the authority of the lighting department manager. *See* Transcript at 43, 49. At hearing and in the documentary evidence, claimant raised several points of dissatisfaction with the lighting department manager. However, claimant did not prove that he faced a grave situation based on any of them.

With respect to the lighting supervisor job claimant applied for in October 2024 and in early 2025, and for which he was not interviewed or hired, claimant failed to show that he was entitled to be interviewed or hired for that job or that the lighting department manager acted inappropriately to the extent she played any role in someone else being hired. With respect to the early 2025 incident in which the lighting department manager yelled at claimant, the employer took appropriate action, suspending the

lighting department manager while they investigated the matter. Once the investigation was complete, the employer disciplined the lighting department manager and required her to take additional training. With respect to the lighting department manager informing claimant in September 2025 that the employer would only have an assistant lead electrician job to offer him for the 2026 theater season, claimant did not show that the lighting department manager acted inappropriately. At the time, the lighting department manager informed claimant that the proposed change was due to budgetary cutbacks, which was plausible, and ultimately the co-lead electrician resigned so claimant continued to work as lead electrician during the 2026 theater season and was never actually demoted.

As to the grievances relating to the lighting department manager that claimant raised in his August 2025 communications, the employer investigated and took action in the areas they deemed appropriate, such as by adopting a safety policy relating to the Genie lift.[3] However, many of the complaints, such as claimant's assertion that the lighting department manager was paid too much or that he had been subjected to wage theft by omission for not getting supervisor's pay while the lighting department manager was on vacation, seem to reflect claimant's unhappiness with his rate of pay or lingering resentments over not being hired as lighting supervisor, rather than to show any impropriety on the part of the lighting department manager. Other of claimant's objections were subjective, such as the assertion that the lighting department manager did not give him proper guidance or disagreements with changes the lighting department manager had made to equipment. All the complaints came the better part of a year before claimant's voluntary leaving and so were remote in time compared to when claimant left work, and did not present him with a situation of gravity.

At hearing, claimant mentioned some issues that exemplified his dissatisfaction with the lighting department manager. Claimant specifically raised the Genie lift issue as an unresolved safety concern that he had with her. Transcript at 13. However, as discussed above, the employer investigated that issue and eventually issued additional safety protocols so that that particular lift was no longer used on that particular stage. Claimant also complained at hearing of an occasion in which a lighting designer, claimant, the lighting department manager, and others were working together at night, cueing lights on a stage, and the lighting department manager drank alcohol with the designer. Transcript at 13-14. Claimant did not establish how he was harmed by the single instance of the lighting department manager drinking alcohol at work and so did not show that the incident placed him in a situation of such gravity that he had no reasonable alternative but to quit work.

Claimant also asserted at hearing that there was an occasion when the lighting department manager "sabotage[d]" claimant by undoing a data networking task that he had worked on. Transcript at 25. However, as the lighting department manager held a position of authority over claimant and had the power to modify or undo the work of subordinate employees, claimant did not show that her act of undoing the data networking task was improper. Lastly, claimant testified that he and the lighting department manager had an argument in January 2026, in which claimant described her as using a "very irate tone." Transcript at 59. However, that the manager might take a heated tone was a foreseeable reaction given that claimant explained that the conversation occurred in the context of him having

[3] The employer also concluded that some of the complaints in the August 2025 communications, such as an assertion that the lighting department manager had prevented claimant from taking breaks, were not made in good faith and, as a result, the employer gave claimant a verbal warning. Exhibit M at 3. Claimant did not show that the employer acted inappropriately in giving claimant this warning or that he faced a situation of gravity based on receiving the warning.

accused the manager of not being truthful to executive leadership. Transcript at 59. Claimant did not establish that a reasonable and prudent person with his shoulder injury would leave work based on the manager's conduct during that interaction.[4]

For the reasons discussed above, claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause. Claimant is disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits effective May 10, 2026.

**DECISION:** Order No. 26-UI-337987 is affirmed.

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

**DATE of Service: October 29, 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.

[4] At hearing, claimant also alluded to his belief that the lighting department manager discriminated against him based on his status as a male and in retaliation for complaints he raised. Transcript at 25. These assertions are outlined in Bureau of Labor and Industries complaints filed by claimant. *See* Exhibit F at 1-2; Exhibit G 1-3. Claimant did not show that he faced a grave situation based on his allegations of discrimination and retaliation. Many of claimant's points of dissatisfaction with the lighting department manager were not proven to have merit. As to those occasions where the lighting department manager may have behaved improperly, such as the early 2025 yelling incident, claimant did not prove that such conduct was retaliation for complaints made or motivated by animus based on claimant's gender.

# 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.