STATE OF FLORIDA
REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Claimant/Appellee

R.A.A.C. Order No. 17-01705

vs.

Referee Decision No. 0030671686-02U

Employer/Appellant

ORDER OF REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

This case comes before the Commission for disposition of the employer's appeal pursuant to Section 443.151(4)(c), Florida Statutes, of a referee's decision which held the claimant not disqualified from receipt of benefits and charged the employer's account.

Pursuant to the appeal filed in this case, the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission has conducted a complete review of the evidentiary hearing record and decision of the appeals referee. *See* §443.151(4)(c), Fla. Stat. The Commission's review is generally limited to the evidence and issues before the referee and contained in the official record.

The issue before the Commission is whether the claimant was discharged by the employer for misconduct connected with work as provided in Section 443.101(1), Florida Statutes.

The referee made the following findings of fact:

> The claimant began work as an assistant meat manager, for the retail grocery store on September 9, 2006. The claimant reported to the meat manager. The claimant was aware of the employer's policies and the procedures for meat grinding and the employer's meat grinding machine cleaning standards and practices. The employer prohibited cross contamination or adulteration of meats from different species (e.g. pork, beef) and required the meat grinding machine to be cleaned after each use. The claimant received warnings, on January 6, 2014, and on March 20, 2014. On April 9, 2014, he was demoted. About March 6, 2017, the district manager directed the retail investigator to commence an

> investigation of the report from a store manager that the claimant cross contaminated meat processing by grinding two different meats, pork and beef[,] without cleaning the grinder machine between types of [meat]. The claimant told the retail investigator there was pork residue in the machine[,] and he denied that he was responsible for the residue[,] and he did not use the meat grinder machine or cause a cross contamination of meat. On March [23] or 24, 2017, the district manager, the retail associate specialist, and the store manager discharged the claimant for violation of the employer's food safety guidelines, specifically for not cleaning the meat grinder machine after use, and for dishonesty.

Based on these findings, the referee held the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct connected with work. Upon review of the record and the arguments on appeal, the Commission concludes material evidence was not correctly addressed or evaluated; consequently, the case must be remanded.

When the issue before the appeals referee relates to the claimant's separation from employment, the employer bears the initial burden of proving either the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work or the claimant voluntarily quit, in which case the burden shifts to the claimant to show good cause for quitting. *See Lewis v. Lakeland Health Care Center, Inc.*, 685 So. 2d 876, 878 (Fla. 2d DCA 1996). The proof necessary to carry this burden must consist of competent, substantial evidence. *See Tallahassee Housing Authority v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 483 So. 2d 413, 414 (Fla. 1986); *De Groot v. Sheffield*, 95 So. 2d 912, 916 (Fla. 1957).

Section 443.036(29), Florida Statutes, states that misconduct connected with work, "irrespective of whether the misconduct occurs at the workplace or during working hours, includes, but is not limited to, the following, which may not be construed in pari materia with each other":

> (a) Conduct demonstrating a conscious disregard of an employer's interests and found to be a deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expects of his or her employee. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, willful damage to an employer's property that results in damage of more than $50; or theft of employer property or property of a customer or invitee of the employer.

> (b) Carelessness or negligence to a degree or recurrence that manifests culpability or wrongful intent, or shows an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to his or her employer.
>
> (c) Chronic absenteeism or tardiness in deliberate violation of a known policy of the employer or one or more unapproved absences following a written reprimand or warning relating to more than one unapproved absence.
>
> (d) A willful and deliberate violation of a standard or regulation of this state by an employee of an employer licensed or certified by this state, which violation would cause the employer to be sanctioned or have its license or certification suspended by this state.
>
> (e)1. A violation of an employer's rule, unless the claimant can demonstrate that:
>
> a. He or she did not know, and could not reasonably know, of the rule's requirements;
>
> b. The rule is not lawful or not reasonably related to the job environment and performance; or
>
> c. The rule is not fairly or consistently enforced.
>
> 2. Such conduct may include, but is not limited to, committing criminal assault or battery on another employee, or on a customer or invitee of the employer or committing abuse or neglect of a patient, resident, disabled person, elderly person, or child in her or his professional care.

In holding the claimant not disqualified from receipt of benefits, the referee concluded the employer presented only hearsay testimony to establish the claimant had violated the employer's meat safety policy and was dishonest and, therefore, failed to meet its burden of proving misconduct. In reaching this conclusion, however, the referee ignored documentary circumstantial evidence which, if properly authenticated, was sufficient to establish a prima facie case of misconduct.

As the Commission has previously held,

> Any element of proof in a reemployment assistance case may be made, or rebutted, by either direct or circumstantial evidence. "Direct evidence" is provided by witnesses who testify to their direct observation of a fact. *Mosley v. State*, 46 So. 3d 510, 526

> n.14 (Fla. 2009). For example, a witness who testifies that he saw another employee take money out of a cash register has provided direct evidence to that fact. Circumstantial evidence, by contrast, is evidence of facts from which another material fact may be inferred. *Id.; see also Lake County Sheriff's Department v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 478 So. 2d 880, 881 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985). For example, a store manager testifies that a store's safe contained $1000 when he counted it after closing one night, but contained only $500 when he counted it before opening the next morning. He further testifies that he reviewed the store's security access log and found that an assistant manager was the only individual in the store during the interim. These facts are sufficient to prove by circumstantial inference that the assistant manager stole the money, and are sufficient to prove that fact over the assistant manager's denial, if the weight of the evidence favors that inference. There is no sound logical basis for automatically preferring or accepting direct evidence over circumstantial evidence. Indeed, such flawed reasoning can operate to deprive parties of their right to a fair hearing.

R.A.A.C. Order No. 14-00590 at pg. 5 (August 27, 2014).[1] Direct evidence has no greater "automatic" or "inherent" value than circumstantial evidence. R.A.A.C. Order No. 14-04612 at pg. 3 (December 1, 2014).[2]

In this case, the employer's witness provided hearsay testimony, based on what was reported to him by a non-testifying witness. The district manager testified that the assistant store manager advised him that the claimant's subordinate reported to her that the claimant had ground pork in the meat grinder without first cleaning the meat grinder as required by the employer's food safety policy. The assistant manager also told the district manager that, shortly after she received this information, she personally observed both pink and red meat in the meat grinder at the same time, which indicated to her that someone had violated the employer's policy by failing to clean the meat grinder between the grinding of different types of meat. In addition, the district manager testified that the assistant store manager said that only the claimant and the subordinate who reported the incident to her were working in the meat grinding room during the time in question, and that the claimant provided mainly excuses rather than explanations when she questioned the claimant about the issue.

---

[1] Available at http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac_finalorders/14-00590.pdf.
[2] Available at http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac_finalorders/14-04612.pdf.

The employer's witness did not have personal knowledge as to the incidents, so the referee correctly concluded this testimony was hearsay that was not otherwise admissible under the hearsay rule exceptions. Such evidence is not, however, worthless. Hearsay that is not otherwise admissible under a hearsay exception is corroborating hearsay – it can be admitted to supplement, explain, or corroborate other competent evidence, if such evidence is admitted. R.A.A.C. Order No. 14-05924 at pg. 6 (April 24, 2015).[3]

This hearsay testimony could have been material, because the employer's evidence was not limited to that testimony; however, the referee failed to address documents which were attached to the hearing notice, received by all parties, and referenced by the employer's witness during the hearing. These documents include two witness statements from the same witness, three warnings issued to the claimant during his employment, the employer's Code of Unacceptable Conduct, and an Associate Handbook Acknowledgment. As the hearing officer, the referee has a duty to preserve the right of each party to present evidence relevant to the issues. Fla. Admin. Code R. 73B-20.024(3). Generally, parties are laypersons unfamiliar with the technical requirements of administrative law. When evidence is submitted by a party pursuant to Florida Administrative Code Rule 73B-20.014(2) and references are made to that evidence at the hearing, the referee should ask the party whether the party intends for the evidence to be made an exhibit and considered by the referee when making his or her decision. Under Section 443.151(4)(b)5.a., Florida Statutes: "Any part of the evidence may be received in written form . . . ." As the statutory language implies, documentary evidence should be received and considered where properly admissible. On remand, the referee is directed to authenticate and mark as exhibits the documentary evidence provided by the employer.

The employer presented two witness statements written by the assistant store manager, previous disciplinary warnings issued to the claimant, along with copies of its policies and the claimant's acknowledgment of receipt of the policies. The assistant store manager's statements provide direct evidence consistent with the district manager's testimony as to what the assistant manager had conveyed to him about the incident. Regarding the disciplinary actions, the record reflects that the first disciplinary warning offered by the employer was issued to the claimant in 2007 regarding his failure to wear a safety glove; the second disciplinary warning was issued to the claimant in 2014 about the claimant's instructions to his subordinates regarding the use of a certain machine; and the third disciplinary warning, also issued to the claimant in 2014, deals with the claimant cutting pork on the meat

[3] Available at http://www.floridajobs.org/finalorders/raac_finalorders/14-05924.pdf.

saw. These documents appear to fall under a statutory exemption to the hearsay rule as business records. Even if this exception is not applicable, however, the evidence must still be evaluated to determine its admissibility and competence under the "residual" exception of Section 443.151(4)(b)5.c.(I)-(II), Florida Statutes.

We reiterate as we have in a number of orders that the processes both of evaluating evidence *and* evaluating a case occurs at two levels. First, the referee must determine whether the parties have met any respective *burdens of production of evidence* they bear. That is, have the parties offered sufficient competent evidence that, *if believed*, would carry their ultimate burden of persuasion? At this stage, the referee merely needs to determine if the evidence is competent; if not, the party has not met its burden of production of evidence, resulting in losing the issue.

Once the competency of the evidence has been determined, and if both sides have met any burdens of production of evidence, the case then advances to the next stage of analysis. Here, the referee determines who has carried any burden of persuasion, and this determination typically depends on which side has been determined more credible (which resolves disputes as to conflicting evidence) and which side's evidence is more persuasive. This process of weighing evidence allows the referee to make findings in the case, which then lead to the legal conclusions and the outcome of the case.

With respect to the burden of production of evidence, if the employer's documentary evidence is authenticated and admitted as establishing what the employer contends it establishes, the employer's documentary and corroborating hearsay evidence would support a reasonable inference that the claimant was culpable for violating the employer's food safety policy and was dishonest about the matter when confronted. Thus, if the employer's evidence is properly admissible, the referee's failure to correctly consider the employer's circumstantial evidence, both competent and the corroborating hearsay, was legal error.

Once an employer makes a prima facie showing that a claimant is guilty of misconduct, the burden of production of evidence shifts to the employee to establish the propriety of the conduct in question. *Alterman Transport Lines, Inc. v. Unemployment Appeals Commission*, 410 So. 2d 568, 569 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982). The claimant offered a contrary version of facts that was sufficient to carry his burden of controverting the employer's evidence in this case. Thus, if the employer's evidence is properly authenticated and admitted, the referee must decide the case based on weighing the evidence and resolving credibility, and not by concluding that the employer failed to offer sufficient proof.

In order to address the points raised above, the referee's decision is vacated and the case is remanded for a supplemental hearing. On remand, the referee shall enclose copies of all of the employer's documents with the notice of hearing. The referee must determine whether the employer's documentary evidence is admissible and, if so, shall consider, analyze, and address the direct and circumstantial evidence offered by the employer to establish that the claimant's actions violated its policies, were in conscious disregard of its interests, amounted to a deliberate violation or disregard of the reasonable standards of behavior which the employer expected of its employees, and were dishonest in nature. The referee shall then render a decision that contains accurate and specific findings of fact and a proper analysis of those facts along with an appropriate credibility determination in accordance with Florida Administrative Code Rule 73B-20.025. Any hearing convened subsequent to this order shall be deemed supplemental, and all evidence currently in the record shall remain in the record.

The decision of the appeals referee is vacated and the case is remanded for further proceedings.

It is so ordered.

REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE APPEALS COMMISSION

Frank E. Brown, Chairman
Thomas D. Epsky, Member
Joseph D. Finnegan, Member

This is to certify that on
10/19/2017 ,
the above Order was filed in the office of the Clerk of the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, and a copy mailed to the last known address of each interested party.
By: Kady Ross
Deputy Clerk

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
REEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
PO BOX 5250
TALLAHASSEE, FL 32314 5250

*61409377 *

Docket No.0030 6716 86-02 Jurisdiction: §443.151(4)(a)&(b) Florida Statutes

CLAIMANT/Appellant ***EMPLOYER/Appellee***

APPEARANCES:

Claimant

Employer Representative

Employer

DECISION OF APPEALS REFEREE

Important appeal rights are explained at the end of this decision.

Derechos de apelación importantes son explicados al final de esta decisión.

Yo eksplike kèk dwa dapèl enpòtan lan fen desizyon sa a.

c

Issues Involved:

CHARGES TO EMPLOYER'S EMPLOYMENT RECORD: Whether benefit payments made to the claimant will be charged to the employment record of the employer, pursuant to Sections 443.101(9); 443.131(3)(a), Florida Statutes; Rules 73B-10.026; 11.018, Florida Administrative Code. (If charges are not at issue on the current claim, the hearing may determine charges on a subsequent claim.)

SEPARATION: Whether the claimant was discharged for misconduct connected with work or voluntarily left work without good cause as defined in the statute, pursuant to Sections 443.101(1), (9), (10), (11), (13); 443.036(29), Florida Statutes; Rule 73B-11.020, Florida Administrative Code.

Findings of Fact: The claimant began work as an assistant meat manager, for the retail grocery store on September 9, 2006. The claimant reported to the meat manager. The claimant was aware of the employer's policies and the procedures for meat grinding and the employer's meat grinding machine cleaning standards and practices. The employer prohibited cross contamination or adulteration of meats from different species (e.g. pork, beef) and required the meat grinding machine to be cleaned after each use. The claimant received warnings, on January 6, 2014, and on March 20, 2014. On April 9, 2014, he was demoted. About March 6, 2017, the district managerdirected the retail investigator to commence an investigation of the report from a store manager that the claimant cross contaminated meat processing by grinding two different meats, pork and beef without cleaning the grinder machine between types of meet. The claimant told the retail investigator there was pork residue in the machine and he denied that he was responsible for the residue and he did not use the meat grinder machine or cause a cross contamination of meat. On March 23, or 24, 2017, the district manager, the retail associate specialist, and the store managerdischarged the claimant for violation of the employer's food safety guidelines, specifically for not cleaning the meat grinder machine after use, and for dishonesty.

Conclusion of Law: The law provides that benefits will not be charged to the employment record of a contributory employer who furnishes required notice to the Department when the claimant left the work without good cause attributable to the employer, was discharged for misconduct connected with the work, refused without good cause an offer of suitable work from the employer, was discharged from work for violating any criminal law punishable by imprisonment or for any dishonest act in connection with the work, refused an offer of suitable work because of the distance to the employment due to a change of residence by the claimant, became separated as a direct result of a natural disaster declared pursuant to the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 and the Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Amendments of 1988, or was discharged for unsatisfactory performance during an initial probationary period that did not exceed ninety calendar days and of which the claimant was informed during the first seven days of work.

The record shows the employer discharged the claimant. The burden of proving misconduct is on the employer. Lewis v. Unemployment Appeals Commission, 498 So.2d 608 (Fla. 5th DCA 1986). The proof must be by a preponderance of competent substantial evidence. De Groot v. Sheffield, 95 So.2d 912 (Fla. 1957); Tallahassee Housing Authority v. Unemployment Appeals Commission, 483 So.2d 413 (Fla. 1986). The testimony shows the claimant was discharged for violation of the employer's food safety guidelines, specifically for not cleaning the meat grinder machine after use, and for dishonesty. The employer's witnesses were the district manager, and the retail investigator. The testimony of the employer's witnesses regarding the incident and the circumstances which lead to the claimant's discharge were based on reports they received from others. The testimony of the employer's witnesses shows they did not have first-hand knowledge of the event. As such, the testimony of the employer's witnesses is hearsay. Hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, or to support a finding if it would be admissible over objection in civil actions. Notwithstanding s. 120.57(1)(c), hearsay evidence may support a finding of fact if: The party against whom it is offered has a reasonable opportunity to review such evidence prior to the hearing; and the appeals referee or special deputy determines, after considering all relevant facts and circumstances, that the evidence is trustworthy and probative and that the interests of justice are best served by its admission into evidence. The claimant's testimony shows he maintained the employer's food safety guide lines and cleaned the meat grinder machine as required. Absent sufficient competent testimony to the contrary, the referee accepts the claimant's evidence. In cases of discharge, the burden is on the employer to establish that the discharge was for misconduct connected with work. The employer did not meet the burden of proof. The behavior of the claimant, as described by the claimant, did not meet the statutory definition of misconduct. The claimant is thus not subject to disqualification.

The law provides that benefits will not be charged to the employment record of a contributory employer who furnishes

required notice to the Department when the claimant left the work without good cause attributable to the employer, was discharged for misconduct connected with the work, refused without good cause an offer of suitable work from the employer, was discharged from work for violating any criminal law punishable by imprisonment or for any dishonest act in connection with the work, refused an offer of suitable work because of the distance to the employment due to a change of residence by the claimant, became separated as a direct result of a natural disaster declared pursuant to the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 and the Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Amendments of 1988, or was discharged for unsatisfactory performance during an initial probationary period that did not exceed ninety calendar days and of which the claimant was informed during the first seven days of work. Since the employer discharged the claimant for reasons other than misconduct, the employer's account will be charged.

The claimant was represented in the hearing by the attorney. The claimant's attorney charged the claimant a flat fee of $150 for consultation and a fee of $100 contingent on the outcome of the case. The referee approves the total fees not to exceed $250 to be paid by the claimant.

Decision: The determination dated April 17, 2017, is REVERSED. The claimant is qualified. The employer's account will be charged.

If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination, unless specified in this decision. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

This is to certify that a copy of the above decision was distributed/mailed to the last known address of each interested party on May 15, 2017.

E. LOSCHI
Appeals Referee

Lisa Rell

By:

LISA RELL, Deputy Clerk

IMPORTANT - APPEAL RIGHTS: This decision will become final unless a written request for review or reopening is filed within 20 calendar days after the distribution/mailed date shown. If the 20th day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday defined in F.A.C. 73B-21.004, filing may be made on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or holiday. If this decision disqualifies and/or holds the claimant ineligible for benefits already received, the claimant will be required to repay those benefits. The specific amount of any overpayment will be calculated by the Department and set forth in a separate overpayment determination. However, the time to request review of this decision is as shown above and is not stopped, delayed or extended by any other determination, decision or order.

A party who did not attend the hearing for good cause may request reopening, including the reason for not attending, at connect.myflorida.com or by writing to the address at the top of this decision. The date of the confirmation page will be the filing date of a request for reopening on the Department's Web Site.

A party who attended the hearing and received an adverse decision may file a request for review to the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); **https://raaciap.floridajobs.org.** If mailed, the postmark date will be the filing date. If faxed, hand-delivered, delivered by courier service other than the United States Postal Service, or submitted via the Internet, the date of receipt will be the filing date. To avoid delay, include the docket number and the last five digits of the claimant's social security number. A party requesting review should specify any and all allegations of error with respect to the referee's decision, and provide factual and/or legal support for these challenges. Allegations of error not specifically set forth in the request for review may be considered waived.

There is no cost to have a case reviewed by the Commission, nor is a party required to be represented by an attorney or other representative to have a case reviewed. The Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission has not been fully integrated into the Department's CONNECT system. While correspondence can be mailed or faxed to the Commission, no correspondence can be submitted to the Commission via the CONNECT system. All parties to an appeal before the Commission must maintain a current mailing address with the Commission. A party who changes his/her mailing address in the CONNECT system must also provide the updated address to the Commission, in writing. All correspondence sent by the Commission, including its final order, will be mailed to the parties at their mailing address on record with the Commission.

IMPORTANTE - DERECHOS DE APELACIÓN: Esta decisión pasará a ser final a menos que una solicitud por escrito para revisión o reapertura se registre dentro de 20 días de calendario después de la distribución/fecha de envìo marcada en que la decisión fue remitida por correo. Si el vigésimo (20) día es un sábado, un domingo o un feriado definidos en F.A.C. 73B-21.004, el registro de la solicitud se puede realizar en el día siguiente que no sea un sábado, un domingo o un feriado. Si esta decisión descalifica y/o declara al reclamante como inelegible para recibir beneficios que ya fueron recibidos por el reclamante, se le requerirá al reclamante rembolsar esos beneficios. La cantidad específica de cualquier sobrepago [pago excesivo de beneficios] será calculada por la Agencia y establecida en una determinación de pago excesivo de beneficios que será emitida por separado. Sin embargo, el límite de tiempo para solicitar la revisión de esta decisión es como se establece anteriormente y dicho límite no es detenido, demorado o extendido por ninguna otra determinación, decisión u orden.

Una parte que no asistió a la audiencia por una buena causa puede solicitar una reapertura, incluyendo la razón por no haber comparecido en la audiencia, en connect.myflorida.com o escribiendo a la dirección en la parte superior de esta decisión. La fecha de la página de confirmación será la fecha de presentación de una solicitud de reapertura en la página de Internet del Departamento.

Una parte que asistió a la audiencia y recibió una decisión adversa puede registrar una solicitud de revisión con la Comisión de Apelaciones de Servicios de Reempleo; Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Fax: 850-488-2123); **https://raaciap.floridajobs.org**. Si la solicitud es enviada por correo, la fecha del sello de la oficina de correos será la fecha de registro de la solicitud. Si es enviada por telefax, entregada a mano, entregada por servicio de mensajería, con la excepción del Servicio Postal de Estados Unidos, o realizada vía el Internet, la fecha en la que se recibe la solicitud será la fecha de registro. Para evitar demora, incluya el número de expediente [*docket number*] y los últimos cinco dígitos del número de seguro social del reclamante. Una parte que solicita una revisión debe especificar cualquiera y todos los alegatos de error con respecto a la decisión del árbitro, y proporcionar fundamentos reales y/o legales para substanciar éstos desafíos. Los alegatos de error que no se establezcan con especificidad en la solicitud de revisión pueden considerarse como renunciados.

No hay ningún costo para tener un caso revisado por la Comisión, ni es requerido que una parte sea representado por un abogado u otro representante para poder tener un caso revisado. La Comisión de Apelación de Asistencia de Reempleo no ha sido plenamente integrado en el sistema CONNECT del Departamento. Mientras que la correspondencia puede ser enviada por correo o por fax a la Comisión, ninguna correspondencia puede ser sometida a la Comisión a través del sistema CONNECT. Todas las partes en una apelación ante la Comisión deben mantener una dirección de correo actual con la Comisión. La parte que cambie su dirección de correo en el sistema CONNECT también debe proporcionar la dirección actualizada a la Comisión, por escrito. Toda la correspondencia enviada por la Comisión, incluida su orden final, será enviada a las partes en su dirección de correo en el registro con la Comisión.

ENPÒTAN - DWA DAPÈL: Desizyon sa a ap definitif sòf si ou depoze yon apèl nan yon delè 20 jou apre dat distribisyon/postaj. Si 20yèm jou a se yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje, jan sa defini lan F.A.C. 73B-21.004, depo an kapab fèt jou aprè a, si se pa yon samdi, yon dimanch oswa yon jou konje. Si desizyon an diskalifye epi/oswa deklare moun k ap fè demann lan pa kalifye pou alokasyon li resevwa deja, moun k ap fè demann lan ap gen pou li remèt lajan li te resevwa a. Se Ajans lan k ap kalkile montan nenpòt ki peman anplis epi y ap detèmine sa lan yon desizyon separe. Sepandan, delè pou mande revizyon desizyon sa a se delè yo bay anwo a; Okenn lòt detèminasyon, desizyon oswa lòd pa ka rete, retade oubyen pwolonje dat sa a.

Yon pati ki te gen yon rezon valab pou li pat asiste seyans lan gen dwa mande pou yo ouvri ka a ankò; fòk yo bay rezon yo pat ka vini an epi fè demann nan sou sitwèb sa a, connect.myflorida.com oswa alekri nan adrès ki mansyone okomansman desizyon sa a. Dat cofimasyon page sa pral jou ou ranpli deman pou reouvewti dan web sit depatman.

Yon pati ki te asiste odyans la epi li resevwa yon desizyon negatif kapab soumèt yon demann pou revizyon retounen travay Asistans Komisyon Apèl la, Suite 101 Rhyne Building, 2740 Centerview Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-4151; (Faks: 850-488-2123); https://raaciap.floridajobs.org. Si poste a, dat tenm ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Si fakse, men yo-a delivre, lage pa sèvis mesaje lòt pase Etazini Sèvis nan Etazini Nimewo, oswa soumèt sou Entènèt la, dat yo te resevwa ap dat li ranpli aplikasyon. Pou evite reta, mete nimewo rejis la ak senk dènye chif nimewo sekirite sosyal demandè a sosyal demandè a sekirite. Yon pati pou mande revizyon ta dwe presize nenpòt ak tout akizasyon nan erè ki gen rapò ak desizyon abit la, yo epi bay sipò reyèl ak / oswa legal pou defi sa yo. Alegasyon sou erè pa espesyalman tabli nan demann nan pou revizyon yo kapab konsidere yo egzante.

Pa gen okenn kou pou Komisyon an revize yon ka, ni ke yon pati dwe reprezante pa yon avoka oubyen lòt reprezantan pou ke la li a revize. Komisyon Apèl Asistans Reyanbochaj pa te entegre antyèman nan sistèm CONNECT Depatman an. Byenke korespondans kapab fakse oubyen pòste bay Komisyon an, okenn korespondans pa kapab soumèt bay Komisyon an atravè sistèm CONNECT. Tout pati ki nan yon apèl devan Komisyon an dwe mentni yon adrès postal ki ajou avèk Komisyon an. Yon pati ki chanje adrès postal li nan sistèm CONNECT la dwe bay Komisyon an adrès ki mete ajou a tou. Tout korespondans ke Komisyon an voye, sa enkli manda final li, pral pòste voye bay pati yo nan adrès postal yo genyen nan achiv Komisyon an.

ENGLISH :
This document contains important information, dates, or eligibility status regarding your Reemployment Assistance claim. It is important for you to understand this document. This document is available in Spanish and Creole. If you do not read or understand Spanish, English, or Creole, call 1-800-681-8102 for free translation assistance regarding your Reemployment Assistance claim.

FRENCH / FRANÇAIS :
Le présent document contient des informations importantes, dont des dates ou le statut d'éligibilité relatif à votre demande d'aide au réemploi. Vous devez absolument en comprendre les tenants et les aboutissants. Si vous ne lisez ni ne comprenez l'anglais, veuillez composer le numéro de téléphone 1-800-681-8102 pour obtenir une traduction gratuite par rapport votre demande d'aide au réemploi.

SPANISH / ESPAÑOL :
Este documento contiene importante información, fechas, o estado de elegibilidad con respecto a su solicitud de Asistencia de Reempleo. Es importante que usted comprenda este documento. Este documento está disponible en Español http://floridajobs.org/Unemployment/bri/BRI_Spanish.pdf. Si no lee o entiende Inglés, llame al 1-800-204-2418 para asistencia de traducción gratuita en relación con su solicitud de Asistencia de Reempleo.

ITALIAN / ITALIANO :
Questo documento contiene informazioni importanti, date o stato di idoneità relativi alla richiesta di reimpiego. È importante comprendere questo documento. Se non legge o comprende l'inglese, chiamare il numero 1-800-681-8102 per assistenza gratuita alla traduzione a proposito della richiesta di reimpiego.

GERMAN / DEUTSCHE :
Dieses Dokument enthält wichtige Informationen, Daten oder Berechtigungsstatus hinsichtlich Ihrer Wiedereinstellungshilfsanspruchs. Es ist wichtig für Sie, dieses Dokument zu verstehen. Falls Sie Deutsch nicht verstehen oder nicht lesen können, wenden Sie sich für eine kostenlose Übersetzungshilfe hinsichtlich Ihres Wiedereinstellungshilfsanspruchs an 1-800-681-8102.

SERBIAN / SRPSKI :
Овај документ садржи важне информације, датуме или доступност везано за Ваш захтјев за помоћ код поновног запошљавања. Важно је да разумијете овај документ. Ако не можете прочитати или разумјети енглески језик, позовите 1-800-681-8102 за бесплатну помоћ с преводом везано за ваш захтјев за помоћ при поновном запошљавању.

BOSNIAN-CROATIAN / BOSANSKI-HRVATSKI :
Ovaj dokument sadrži važne informacije, datume ili status kvalificiranosti po pitanju vašeg traženja podrške pri ponovnom zapošljavanju. Za vas je važno da razumijete ovaj dokument. Ako ne možete čitati ili razumjeti engleski, pozovite 1-800-681-8102 da dobijete besplatnu pomoć pri prijevodu u vezi vašeg traženja podrške pri ponovnom zapošljavanju.

HAITIAN CREOLE / KREYÒL AYISYEN :
Dokiman sa a gen enfòmasyon enpòtan, dat, oubyen estati kalifikasyon konsènan reklamasyon Asistans Reyanbochaj ou. Li enpòtan pou ou konprann dokiman sa a. Dokiman sa disponib an kreyòl nan http://floridajobs.org/Unemployment/bri/BRI_Creole.pdf. Si ou pa li oswa konprann anglè rele 1-800-204-2418 pou sèvis tradiksyon gratis konsènan reklamasyon Asistans Reyanbochaj ou.

CHINESE TRADITIONAL / 中國 :
本檔包含與您的**再就業援助**申請相關的重要資訊、日期或資格有效狀態。請您務必理解本檔之內容。如果您閱讀或理解英語的能力有限，請撥電話 1-800-681-8102，取得與您的**再就業援助**申請相關的免費翻譯協助。

CHINESE SIMPLIFIED / 中文 :
本文件包含与您的**再就业援助**申请相关的重要信息、日期或资格有效状态。请您务必理解本文件的内容。如果您阅读或理解英语的能力有限，请拨电话 1-800-681-8102，获得与您的**再就业援助**申请相关的免费翻译协助。

JAPANESE / 日本語 :
この文書には、あなたの再雇用支援の申し立てに関する重要な情報、日付、または資格が示されています。必ずこの文書をよく読んで内容を理解してください。英語を読むことも理解することもできない場合は、お電話（1-800-681-8102）にてお問い合わせになり、再雇用支援の申し立てに関する無料の翻訳支援を受けてください。

VIETNAMESE / TIẾNG VIỆT :
Hồ sơ này có các thông tin quan trọng, ngày tháng, hoặc tình trạng điều kiện hội đủ về đơn đề nghị Hỗ Trợ Tìm Việc Làm của quý vị. Điều quan trọng là quý vị phải hiểu rõ hồ sơ này. Nếu quý vị không đọc hoặc hiểu được tiếng Anh, hãy gọi đến số 1-800-681-8102 để được hỗ trợ biên dịch miễn phí về đơn đề nghị Hỗ Trợ Tìm Việc Làm của quý vị.

ARABIC / العربية اللغة :
يحتوي هذا المستند على معلومات مهمة أو تواريخ أو وضع الأهلية فيما يتعلق بدعوى المساعدة في إعادة التوظيف. ومن الأهمية لك أن تفهم هذا المستند. وإذا لم تقرأ النص الإنجليزي أو تفهمه، يرجى الاتصال على للحصول هاتف رقم: 1-800-681-8102 على الترجمة المتعلقة بدعوى المساعدة في إعادة التوظيف.

FARSI / فارسی :
این سند حاوی اطلاعات، تاریخها یا تقاضای واجدالشرایط بودن شما در مورد درخواست کمک هزینه استخدام مجدد شما می باشد. درک این سند برای شما مهم است. اگر نمی توانید به انگلیسی بخوانید یا انگلیسی نمی فهمید با شماره 1-800-681-8102 برای ترجمه رایگان در مورد تقاضای کمک هزینه استخدام مجدد خود تماس بگیرید.

RUSSIAN / РУССКИЙ :
В этом документе содержится важная информация, даты или сведения о статусе соответствия требованиям в отношении Вашего заявления о помощи в получении новой работы при увольнении. Важно, чтобы Вы поняли этот документ. Если Вы не можете прочесть текст на английском языке или не понимаете английский язык, позвоните по номеру 1-800-681-8102, чтобы получить бесплатные услуги перевода в отношении Вашего заявления о помощи в получении новой работы при увольнении.