



COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL

State	Statute Reference	Notes	Can UI decisions be used in other legal matters?
AL	Quentin Lamar HALE v. HYUNDAI MOTOR MANUFACTURING ALABAMA, LLC. 2100991 - 43 P.S. § 829	Any decision made by the department or any referee or the board shall not be subject to collateral attack as to any application claim or claims covered thereby or otherwise be disturbed, unless appealed from.	No
AK	Sec. 23.20.455. Rule of decision and certification to department.	(a) Final decisions of the department and the principles of law declared in their support are binding in all subsequent proceedings under this chapter involving similar questions unless expressly or impliedly overruled by a later decision of the department or of a court. Final decisions of appeal tribunals and the principles of law declared in their support are binding on the employees and representatives of the department and are persuasive authority in subsequent appeal tribunal proceedings. (b) If in a subsequent proceeding the department or an appeal tribunal has serious doubt as to the correctness of a principle previously declared by an appeal tribunal or by the department, or if there is an apparent inconsistency or conflict in final decisions of comparable authority, then the findings of fact in the case may be certified, together with the question of law involved, to the department. After giving notice and reasonable opportunity for hearing upon the law to all parties to the proceedings, the department shall certify to the appropriate employees or representatives of the department or appeal tribunal and the parties its answer to the question submitted; or the department in its discretion may remove to itself the entire proceeding as provided in AS 23.20.440 and give its decision upon the entire case.	Yes
AR	A.C.A. § 19-10-306	If an individual commences a civil action in any court of law within this state which arises out of the same subject matter or occurrence that is the subject matter of a complaint before the Arkansas State Claims Commission, the commission shall recognize any final judgment or order rendered in the civil action as a bar to further consideration of the claim in accordance with principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel.	Yes
AZ	Ferris v. Hawkins, 135 Ariz. 329 (App. 1983)	"whether a final judgment . in an unemployment compensation appeal may be given . collateral estoppel effect in an appeal from a decision of the State Personnel Board . where both proceedings arose out of the discharge of the employee from the Department of Corrections."	Yes
CA	UIC § 1960	Any finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made by a hearing officer, administrative law judge, or any person with the authority to make findings of fact or law in any action or proceeding before the appeals board, shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, and shall not be used as evidence in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, between an individual and his or her present or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, court, or judge of this state or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No

CO	Indus. Comm'n v. Moffat County Sch. Dist. RE No. 1, 732 P.2d 616, 620 (Colo. 1987)	In the unemployment compensation proceeding, Blaine initially alleged that she was dismissed from the School District for "lack of work." She denied that she participated in a party with her students or drank beer at their invitation, and claimed that she was "found innocent" by the hearing officer. The School District contested the claim, and alleged that the circumstances surrounding Blaine's dismissal foreclosed an award of unemployment benefits. On September 13, 1984, a deputy of the Division of Employment and Training (Division) found that Blaine was discharged "due to the publicity involved" and "in the best interest of the employer," and awarded full benefits to Blaine. The deputy's decision was affirmed by an appeals referee, who held that the findings of fact entered by the hearing officer in the dismissal proceeding were binding on Blaine and the School District, but that the Board's rejection of the hearing officer's recommendation made the School District responsible for Blaine's termination. The School District appealed, and the Industrial Commission (Commission) affirmed. The court of appeals reversed the Commission's decision, holding that the Board's findings and conclusions were binding on the parties under the doctrine of collateral estoppel, and that those findings precluded an award of unemployment compensation.	Yes
CT	Sec. 31-249f. Decisions of board as precedents, referees' decisions as authority. Index of cases decided.	(a) Final decisions of the board shall be binding in all subsequent proceedings involving similar questions. Final decisions of referees and the principles of law declared in their support shall be binding on the administrator and shall further be persuasive authority in subsequent referee proceedings. If in any subsequent proceeding the administrator or a referee has serious doubt as to the correctness of any principles previously declared by a referee or by the board, or if there is an apparent inconsistency or conflict in final decisions of comparable authority, then the findings of fact in such case may be certified, together with the question of law involved, to the board. After giving notice and reasonable opportunity for hearing upon the law to all parties to the proceedings, the board shall certify to the administrator or referee and the parties its answer to the question submitted; or the board in its discretion may remove to itself the entire proceeding as provided in section 31-248a and render its decision upon the entire case.	Yes
DC	§ 51-111. Determination of claims; hearing; appeal; witness fees.	Any finding of fact or law, determination, judgment, conclusion, or final order made by a claims examiner, hearing officer, appeals examiner, the Director, or any other person having the power to make findings of fact or law in connection with any action or proceeding under this subchapter, shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding between an individual and his present or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, court, or judge of the District of Columbia or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No
DE	§ 3323 Judicial review; procedure.	(c) It shall not be necessary in any judicial proceeding under this section to enter exceptions to the rulings of the Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board and no bond shall be required for entering such appeal. Upon the final determination of such judicial proceeding, the Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board shall enter an order in accordance with such determination. A petition for judicial review shall not act as a supersedeas or stay, nor shall the Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board or any court enter an order of supersedeas or stay which shall delay the payment of any benefits to which the claimant has been determined to be entitled or delay any determination of claimant's rights to any benefits.	No
FL	443.0315 Effect of finding, judgment, conclusion, or order in separate or subsequent action or proceeding; use as evidence.	Any finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made by a hearing officer, the commission, or any person with the authority to make findings of fact or law in any proceeding under this chapter is not conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, other than an action or proceeding under this chapter, between an individual and his or her present or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, court, or judge of this state or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts	No

GA	Shields v. BELLSOUTH ADVERTISING & PUB.	The findings were collaterally estopped by unemployment hearing. "the initial unemployment benefits litigation fully explored the reasons behind the plaintiff's dismissal, any inconsistent judicial decision would be barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel."	Yes
HI	§383-41 Judicial review.	The director of labor and industrial relations or any party to the proceedings before the referee may obtain judicial review of the decision of the referee in the manner provided in chapter 91, by instituting proceedings in the circuit court of the circuit in which the claimant resides or in which the claimant was last employed. In any such court proceedings, every other party to the proceeding before the referee shall be made a party respondent. The director shall be deemed to be a party to any such proceeding. The proceedings shall be heard in a summary manner and shall be given precedence over all other civil cases except proceedings arising under the workers' compensation law of the State. Proceedings for review by the intermediate appellate court may be taken and had in the same manner as is provided for a review of a judgment of a circuit court. No bond shall be required as a condition of initiating a proceeding for judicial review or initiating proceedings for review by the intermediate appellate court. Upon the final termination of any judicial proceeding, the referee shall enter an order in accordance with the mandate of the court. [L 1939, c 219, §6(i); am L 1941, c 304, §1, pt of subs 18; RL 1945, §4242; RL 1955, §93-40; am L 1965, c 96, §71; HRS §383-41; am L 1975, c 41, §1; am L 2004, c 202, §39; am L 2006, c 94, §1; am L 2010, c 109, §1]	No
IA	96.6 Filing — determination — appeal.	4. Effect of determination. A finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made pursuant to this section by an employee or representative of the department, administrative law judge, or the employment appeal board, is binding only upon the parties to proceedings brought under this chapter, and is not binding upon any other proceedings or action involving the same facts brought by the same or related parties before the division	No
ID	72-736. DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT NONAPPEALABLE	A LIEN UPON EXECUTION. The decree or judgment from the district court entered pursuant to section 72-735, [Idaho Code,] shall have the same effect, and all proceedings in relation thereto shall thereafter be the same as though said decree or judgment had been rendered in an action duly heard and determined by said court, and shall with like effect be entered and docketed, except that there shall be no appeal therefrom and the same shall not constitute a lien upon the real property of the employer until recorded as any other judgment.	Yes
IL	820 ILCS 405/1900(B) Unemployment Insurance Act.	No finding, determination, decision, ruling or order (including any finding of fact, statement or conclusion made therein) issued pursuant to this Act shall be admissible or used in evidence in any action other than one arising out of this Act, nor shall it be binding or conclusive except as provided in this Act, nor shall it constitute res judicata, regardless of whether the actions were between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No
IN	McClanahan v. Remington Freight Lines, Inc.	"In light of all these circumstances, fairness requires that we not apply collateral estoppel. The relative informality of the particular administrative procedure at issue here does not meet the test used in Cox. It is a procedure designed for quick and inexpensive determinations of unemployment benefits. Recognizing it as a basis for collateral estoppel might well force the parties to convert such proceedings into longer and more expensive ones."	No
KS	44-709. Claims for benefits; filing; determination of; appointment of referees; appeals, time; procedures; board of review, membership, compensation and duties; witness fees; judicial review of order of board; findings, judgments, determinations and orders hereunder not admissible or binding in separate or subsequent action or proceeding.	(j) Any finding of fact or law, judgment, determination, conclusion or final order made by the employment security board of review or any examiner, special examiner, referee or other person with authority to make findings of fact or law pursuant to the employment security law is not admissible or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, between a person and a present or previous employer brought before an arbitrator, court or judge of the state or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No

KY	Hickey v. General Electric Company - Provision 341.420 (5)	The court in essence concluded that a plaintiff could bring a private right of action against an employer for an alleged violation of KRS 341.990(6)(a), Kentucky's criminal prohibition against making false statements, during unemployment proceedings.	No
LA	TITLE 23 - Labor and Worker's Compensation RS 23:1632. Conclusiveness of determination and decision	Except insofar as reconsideration of any determination is had under the provisions of R.S. 23:1626, any right, fact, or matter in issue, directly passed upon or necessarily involved in a determination or redetermination which has become final, or in a decision on appeal under the subsection which has become final, shall be conclusive for all the purposes of this Chapter as between the administrator, the claimant, and all employing units who had notice of such determination, redetermination or decision. Subject to appeal proceedings and judicial review, any determination, redetermination or decision as to rights to benefits shall be conclusive for all the purposes of this Chapter and shall not be subject to collateral attack by any employing unit, irrespective of notice.	Yes
MA	Section 46: Confidential information; admissibility as evidence; exceptions to disclosure restrictions	(a) Except as provided in this section, information secured pursuant to this chapter is confidential and for the exclusive use and information of the department in the discharge of its duties. Such information is not a public record nor admissible in any action or proceeding, except as provided in this section. This information is absolutely privileged and shall not be made the subject matter or basis in any action of slander, libel or emotional distress.	No
MD	MSPB - 17-15 Final Decision - Montgomery County Maryland	"We conclude that the expedited, informal, and limited procedures afforded at the UI Lower Appeals division hearing did not provide the County with a fair opportunity to present its case, and that due to the small stakes involved, the County lacked a sufficient incentive to vigorously defend itself. "	No
ME	§1047. Information privileged	All information transmitted to the bureau, the commission or its duly authorized representatives pursuant to this chapter is absolutely privileged and may not be made the subject matter or basis in any action of slander or libel in any court in this State. The privileged nature of any such information may not limit or affect the use of that information in any prosecution or action to enforce Title 39-A, section 324.	No
MI	Storey v. Meijer, Inc	"This case presents the issue whether an administrative adjudication of disqualification for unemployment compensation benefits may be used to preclude the litigation of issues in a subsequent civil suit for wrongful discharge or breach of employment contract. We conclude that the application of collateral estoppel to the administrative determinations of the MESC would be contrary to legislative intent and considerations of public policy. An MESC proceeding designed to determine eligibility for unemployment benefits is not an adequate substitute for full access to the circuit court with the full range of remedies available. Consequently, issue preclusion is not available for determinations of the MESC."	No
MN	268.105 Appeals Subd. 5a.No collateral estoppel.	No findings of fact or decision or order issued by an unemployment law judge may be held conclusive or binding or used as evidence in any separate or subsequent action in any other forum, be it contractual, administrative, or judicial, except proceedings provided for under this chapter, regardless of whether the action involves the same or related parties or involves the same facts.	No

MO	288.215. Finding of fact, conclusion of law, judgment or order not conclusive or binding, when — use of evidence in other proceedings.	<p>1. Any finding of fact, conclusion of law, judgment or order made by an appeals tribunal, the labor and industrial relations commission or any person with the authority to make findings of fact or law in any proceeding under this chapter shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action not brought under this chapter, and shall not be used as evidence in any subsequent or separate action not brought under this chapter, before an arbitrator, commissioner, commission, administrative law judge, judge or court of this state or of the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.</p> <p>2. Any finding of fact, conclusion of law, judgment or order made by an arbitrator, commissioner, commission, administrative law judge, judge or any other person or body with authority to make findings of fact or law in any proceeding not brought under this chapter shall not be binding or conclusive on an appeals tribunal or the labor and industrial relations commission in any subsequent or separate proceeding brought under this chapter, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.</p> <p>3. Nothing in subsection 1 of this section shall be construed to prevent the use of evidence presented in any proceeding under this chapter in any other proceeding not brought under this chapter.</p>	No
MS	§ 71-5-531. Court review [Repealed effective July 1, 2019]	In any judicial proceedings under this section, the findings of the Board of Review as to the facts, if supported by evidence and in the absence of fraud, shall be conclusive, and the jurisdiction of the court shall be confined to questions of law.	Yes
MT	MT Code § 39-51-110 (2014)	A finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made with respect to a determination made under this chapter may not be conclusive or binding or used as evidence in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding in another forum except for proceedings under this chapter, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts	No
NC	Court of Appeals of North Carolina: Johnny E. WORKMAN, Employee, Plaintiff, v. RUTHERFORD ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION, Employer, Self Insured (Federated Rural Electric Insurance Exchange, Third Party Administrator), Defendant. No. COA04-491. (2005)	No legislation available - "Defendant contends the Commission erred in failing to address its argument that the issue of REMC's decision to terminate plaintiff's employment had already been litigated and decided by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission ("ESC"). We disagree."	Yes
ND	52-06-22. Rule of decision	The final decisions of the bureau or of an appeal tribunal and the principles of law declared by it in arriving at such decisions, unless expressly or impliedly overruled by a later decision of the bureau or by a court of competent jurisdiction, are binding upon the bureau and any appeal tribunal in subsequent proceedings which involve similar questions of law. In any subsequent proceeding, if the job insurance division or any appeal tribunal has serious doubt as to the correctness of any principle so declared, the division or appeal tribunal may certify its findings of fact in the case, together with the question of law involved, to the bureau, which after giving notice and reasonable opportunity for hearing upon the law to all parties to such proceeding Page No. 13 thereupon shall certify to the division, or to the appeal tribunal, and the parties, its answer to the questions submitted. If the question thus certified to the bureau arises in connection with a claim for benefits, the bureau in its discretion may remove to itself the entire proceedings on such claim, and after proceeding in accordance with the requirements of the North Dakota unemployment compensation law with respect to proceedings before an appeal tribunal, shall render its decision upon the entire claim. Any decision made under the North Dakota unemployment compensation law after the removal of the proceedings upon a claim to the bureau has the effect of a decision under section 52-06-19 and is subject to judicial review within the same time and to the same extent.	Yes

NE	48-637. Administrative appeals; decisions; effect in subsequent proceedings; certification of questions.	The final decisions of a hearing officer and the principles of law declared by him or her in arriving at such decisions, unless expressly or impliedly overruled by a later decision of a hearing officer or by a court of competent jurisdiction, shall be binding upon the commissioner and any adjudicator in subsequent proceedings which involve similar questions of law, except that if in connection with any subsequent proceeding the commissioner or an adjudicator has serious doubt as to the correctness of any principle so declared, he or she may certify his or her findings of fact in such case together with the question of law involved to a hearing officer who, after giving notice and reasonable opportunity for hearing upon the law to all parties to such proceedings, shall thereupon certify to the commissioner, such adjudicator, and such parties his or her answer to the question submitted. If the question thus certified to a hearing officer arises in connection with a claim for benefits, a hearing officer in his or her discretion may remove to himself or herself the entire proceedings on such claim and, after proceeding in accordance with the requirements of sections 48-634 to 48-643 with respect to proceedings before a hearing officer, shall render his or her decision upon the entire claim	Yes
NH	282-A:180 Collateral Estoppel.	Decisions rendered under this chapter shall not be admissible in any court or in administrative or other proceedings, not under or pursuant to this chapter, for the purpose of barring such court or proceeding from making independent findings of fact and	No
NJ	34:1A-30. Pending actions or proceedings	This act shall not affect actions or proceedings, civil or criminal, brought by or against any department, commission, board, officer or other agency, the functions, powers and duties of which have been herein assigned or transferred to the Department of Labor and Industry or to any officer or agency designated, continued or constituted hereunder, and pending on the effective date of this act, but such actions or proceedings may be prosecuted or defended in the same manner and to the same effect by the department, officer or agency to which such assignment or transfer has been made hereunder, as if the foregoing provisions had not taken effect; nor shall any of the foregoing provisions affect any order or recommendation made by, or other matters or proceedings before, any department, commission, board, officer or agency, the functions, powers and duties of which have been herein assigned or transferred to the Department of Labor and Industry or to any officer or agency designated, continued or constituted hereunder, and all such matters or proceedings pending before such department, commission, board, officer or other agency on the effective date of this act shall be continued by the department, officer or agency to which such assignment or transfer has been made hereunder, as if the foregoing provisions had not taken effect.	No
NM	51-1-55. Res judicata and collateral estoppel prohibition.	Any findings of fact or law, judgment, conclusions or final order made by an unemployment insurance claims examiner, hearing officer, the board of review or any person with the authority to make findings of fact or law in any action or proceeding under the Unemployment Compensation Law, shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate proceeding between an individual and his present or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, hearing officer, court or judge of this state or the United States regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No
NV	NRS 612.533 Introduction of certain evidence concerning claims for benefits prohibited in separate or subsequent proceeding.	Any finding of fact or law, judgment, determination, conclusion or final order made by the Administrator or an Appeal Tribunal, examiner, Board of Review, district court or any other person with the authority to make findings of fact or law pursuant to NRS 612.450 to 612.530, inclusive, is not admissible or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, between a person and that person's present or previous employer brought before an arbitrator, court or judge of this State or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No
NY	LAB - Labor Title 8 - (620 - 626) HEARINGS AND APPEALS	§ 626. Exclusive procedure. The procedure herein provided for hearings before referees with respect to any determination, rule, or order of the commissioner, and for decisions thereon and for appeals therefrom, first to the appeal board and thereafter to the courts, shall be the sole and exclusive	No

OH	Article 18 - UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAW	No finding of fact or law, decision, or order of the director, hearing officer, the commission, or a reviewing court under this section or section 4141.28 of the Revised Code shall be given collateral estoppel or res judicata effect in any separate or subsequent judicial, administrative, or arbitration proceeding,	No
OK	§40-2-610.1. Conclusiveness of proceedings.	Any findings of fact or law, judgment, conclusion or final order made by the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, its referees, the Appeal Tribunal or Board of Review in an unemployment insurance proceeding shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, and shall not be used as evidence in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, between an individual and his or her present or prior employer in any other forum regardless of whether or not the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts. Added by Laws 1991, c. 295, § 2, eff. Sept. 1, 1991. Renumbered from § 2-610A of this title by Laws 2006, c. 176, § 29, eff. July 1, 2006.	No
OR	626 - Exclusive procedure.	Notwithstanding ORS 43.130 (Judicial orders that are conclusive) and 43.160 (What determined by former judgment), the decisions, findings, conclusions, final orders and judgments that arise out of hearings under ORS 657.270 (Hearing upon decision), review proceedings under ORS 657.275 (Review by Employment Appeals Board) and judicial review proceedings under ORS 657.282 (Judicial review of decisions under ORS 657.275): (1) May not be used for the purpose of claim preclusion or issue preclusion in any other action or proceeding except an administrative or civil action or proceeding under this chapter; and (2) Are not admissible as evidence in any other civil action or proceeding other than civil actions or proceedings under this chapter or in determination of eligibility for public assistance or supplemental nutrition assistance under ORS 412.001 (Definitions) to 412.161 (Policy on two-parent families) and	No
PA	Mathis v. Christian Heating and Air Conditioning, Inc. 91 F.Supp.3d 651 (U.S.E.D.PA 2015) : Title 43 P.S. Labor § 829. Finality of decisions	"Christain Heating and Air argued collateral estoppel barred further litigation as the same allegations were made prior unemployment proceedings and the ruling was against the Defendant. The unemployment findings were that the claimant was not terminated due to religious discrimination but that he voluntarily quit. CHAC sucessfully filed a motion to dismiss based on collateral estoppel. : Any decision made by the department or any referee or the board shall not be subject to collateral attack as to any application claim or claims covered thereby or otherwise be disturbed, unless appealed from.	Maybe?
PR		Legislation Not Available Online	No
RI	§ 28-44-50. Rule of decision – Certification of questions to board of review.	Final decisions of the board of review and the principles of law declared in their support shall be binding in all subsequent proceedings involving similar questions, unless expressly or impliedly overruled by a later decision of the board of review or of a court of competent jurisdiction. Final decisions of appeal tribunals and the principles of law declared in their support shall be binding on the director and shall be persuasive authority in subsequent appeal tribunal proceedings. If in any subsequent proceedings, the director or an appeal tribunal has serious doubt as to the correctness of any principles previously declared by an appeal tribunal or by the board of review, or if there is an apparent inconsistency or conflict in final decisions or comparable authority, then the findings of fact in that case may be certified, together with the question of law involved, to the board of review. After giving notice and reasonable opportunity for hearing upon the law to all parties to the proceedings, the board of review shall certify to the director or appeal tribunal and the parties in interest its answer to the question submitted, or the board of review, in its discretion, may remove to itself the entire proceeding as provided in § 28-44-48 and render its decision upon the entire case.	No

SC	SECTION 41-35-750. Procedure to obtain review.	In a judicial proceeding under this chapter, the findings of the department regarding facts, if supported by evidence and in the absence of fraud, must be conclusive and the jurisdiction of the administrative law court must be confined to questions of law. These actions, and the questions so certified, must be heard in a summary manner and must be given precedence over other cases.	No
SD	61-7-24. Findings, conclusions, and decisions not admissible as evidence in separate or subsequent actions or proceedings.	No finding of fact, conclusion of law, decision or final order made by an appeals referee or the secretary of labor and regulation in any action under this chapter may be used as evidence in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding between an individual and the individual's present or former employer brought before an arbitrator, court or judge of this state or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No
TN	50-7-304. Procedure for claims and appeals.	(k) Conclusiveness of Findings. No finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made with respect to a claim for unemployment compensation under this chapter may be conclusive in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding in another forum, except proceedings under this chapter, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No
TX	Igal v. Brightstar Info. Tech. Group, Inc., 250 S.W.3d 78 (Tex. 2008) ; I Gotcha, Inc. v. Holzer, No. 2-09-236-CV, 2010 WL 2636154 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Jul. 1, 2010)	Igal v. Brightstar Info. Tech. Group, Inc. - Claim 18 months after separation. Texas Workforce Decision concluded that the claim lacked jurisdiction because he filed a claim more than 180 days after his separation. Igal sued his former employer (rather than request a rehearing with TWC) for breach of contract and declaratory judgement. Employer argued the most recent legislation was barred by res judicata. : I Gotcha, Inc. v. Holzer - Feb 2006, Holzer filed an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) charge against I Gotcha. After termination in December 2006, Holzer filed for UI Benefits. Holzer was awarded benefits in April 2007.	Yes
UT	35A-1-302. Review of administrative order -- Finality of Workforce Appeals Board's order.	(3) If an order is appealed to the court of appeals after the party appealing the order has exhausted all administrative appeals, the court of appeals has jurisdiction to review, reverse, or annul any order of the Workforce Appeals Board, or to suspend or delay the operation or execution of the order of the Workforce Appeals Board being appealed.	
VA	§ 60.2-625. Judicial review.	B. From any circuit court decision involving (i) the provisions of § 60.2-612 or § 60.2-618, (ii) whether an employing unit constitutes an employer or (iii) whether services performed for or in connection with the business of an employing unit constitute employment for such employing unit, the Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to review such decision regardless of the amount involved in any claim for benefits. It shall not be necessary, in any proceeding under this chapter, to enter exceptions to the rulings of the Commission or an appeal tribunal, and no bond shall be required upon an appeal to any court. Upon the final determination of such judicial proceeding, the Commission shall administer the Unemployment Compensation Fund in accordance with such determination. C. The Commission shall have the right to appeal a decision of a circuit court in any proceeding under this chapter.	no
VI		Legislation Not Available Online	no
VT	Title 21 - § 1353. Collateral use prohibited	Any determination, redetermination, finding of fact, conclusion of law, decision, final order, or final judgment entered or made by a claims adjudicator or other authorized representative of the Commissioner, an appeals referee, the Employment Security Board, or a court of competent jurisdiction in any type of proceeding under this chapter is binding only between the Department and all parties in that proceeding and is not binding, conclusive, or admissible in any separate or subsequent action between an individual and his or her present or former employer brought before an arbitrator, court, or judge of this State or of the United States, regardless of whether the prior proceeding was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts. (Added 1989, No. 132 (Adj. Sess.), § 7.)	No

WA	RCW 50.32.097 Applicability of finding, determination, etc., to other action.	Any finding, determination, conclusion, declaration, or final order made by the commissioner, or his or her representative or delegate, or by an appeal tribunal, administrative law judge, reviewing officer, or other agent of the department for the purposes of Title 50 RCW, shall not be conclusive, nor binding, nor admissible as evidence in any separate action outside the scope of Title 50 RCW between an individual and the individual's present or prior employer before an arbitrator, court, or judge of this state or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts or was reviewed pursuant to RCW 50.32.120.	No
WI	108.101 Effect of finding, determination, decision or judgment.	(1) No finding of fact or law, determination, decision or judgment made with respect to rights or liabilities under this chapter is admissible or binding in any action or administrative or judicial proceeding in law or in equity not arising under this chapter, unless the department is a party or has an interest in the action or proceeding because of the discharge of its duties under this chapter.	No
WV	§21A-7-9. Appeal from appeal tribunal's decision; finality of decision.	The decision of the board shall be final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance therewith, unless a claimant, last employer, or other interested party appeals to the circuit court of Kanawha county within thirty days after mailing of notification of the board's decision: Provided, That, in cases relating to a disqualification under subdivision (4) of section three of article six the decision of the board shall be final and benefits shall be paid or denied in accordance therewith, unless a claimant, last employer, or other interested party appeals to the circuit court of Kanawha county within twenty days after mailing of notification of the board's decision. Parties to the proceedings before the board shall be made defendants in any such appeal; and the commissioner shall be a necessary party to such judicial review.	No
WY	27-3-406. Determinations deemed conclusive; matters of law binding; limiting actions.	(c) Any determination, redetermination, finding of fact, conclusion of law, order, decision or final judgment entered or made by a deputy, appeal tribunal, special examiner, the department, the commission or a court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to this act or the rules and regulations of the commission is binding only between the department and all adverse parties thereto, and is not binding, conclusive or admissible in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding between an individual and employing unit previously subject to this act, regardless of whether the prior action before the department or commission was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts.	No

Created April 2018 - Please note this is not legal advice.