(2) There must have been a realistic opportunity to obtain the financing or business sought.

(3) The financing or business sought must have been sufficient, if obtained, to have enabled the employer to avoid or postpone the shutdown. The employer must be able to objectively demonstrate that the amount of capital or the volume of new business sought would have enabled the employer to keep the facility, operating unit, or site open for a reasonable period of time.

(4) The employer reasonably and in good faith must have believed that giving the required notice would have precluded the employer from obtaining the needed capital or business. The employer must be able to objectively demonstrate that it reasonably thought that a potential customer or source of financing would not choose to do business with a troubled company or whose workforce would be looking for other jobs. The actions of an employer relying on the “faltering company” exception will be viewed in a company-wide context. Thus, a company with access to capital markets or with cash reserves may not avail itself of this exception by looking solely at the financial condition of the facility, operating unit, or site.

(b) The “unforeseeable business circumstances” exception under section 3(b)(2)(A) of WARN applies to plant closings and mass layoffs caused by business circumstances that were not reasonably foreseeable at the time that 60-day notice would have been required.

(1) An important indicator of a business circumstance that is not reasonably foreseeable is that the circumstance is caused by some sudden, dramatic, and unexpected action or condition outside the employer’s control. A principal client’s sudden and unexpected termination of a major contract with the employer, a strike at a major supplier of the employer, and an unanticipated and dramatic major economic downturn might each be considered a business circumstance that is not reasonably foreseeable. A government ordered closing of an employment site that occurs without prior notice also may be an unforeseeable business circumstance.

(2) The test for determining when business circumstances are not reasonably foreseeable focuses on an employer’s business judgment. The employer must exercise such commercially reasonable business judgment as would a similarly situated employer in predicting the demands of its particular market. The employer is not required, however, to accurately predict general economic conditions that also may affect demand for its products or services.

(c) The “natural disaster” exception in section 3(b)(2)(B) of WARN applies to plant closings and mass layoffs due to any form of a natural disaster.

(1) Floods, earthquakes, droughts, storms, tidal waves or tsunamis and similar effects of nature are natural disasters under this provision.

(2) To qualify for this exception, an employer must be able to demonstrate that its plant closing or mass layoff is a direct result of a natural disaster.

(3) While a disaster may preclude full or any advance notice, such notice as is practicable, containing as much of the information required in §639.7 as is available in the circumstances of the disaster still must be given, whether in advance or after the fact of an employment loss caused by a natural disaster.

(4) Where a plant closing or mass layoff occurs as an indirect result of a natural disaster, the exception does not apply but the “unforeseeable business circumstance” exception described in paragraph (b) of this section may be applicable.

§ 639.10 When may notice be extended?

Additional notice is required when the date or schedule of dates of a planned plant closing or mass layoff is extended beyond the date or the ending date of any 14-day period announced in the original notice as follows:

(a) If the postponement is for less than 60 days, the additional notice should be given as soon as possible to
the parties identified in §639.6 and should include reference to the earlier notice, the date (or 14-day period) to which the planned action is postponed, and the reasons for the postponement. The notice should be given in a manner which will provide the information to all affected employees.

(b) If the postponement is for 60 days or more, the additional notice should be treated as new notice subject to the provisions of §§639.5, 639.6 and 639.7 of this part. Rolling notice, in the sense of routine periodic notice, given whether or not a plant closing or mass layoff is impending, and with the intent to evade the purpose of the Act rather than give specific notice as required by WARN, is not acceptable.
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§ 640.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) Purpose. (1) Section 303(a)(1) of the Social Security Act requires, for the purposes of title III of that Act, that a State unemployment compensation law include provision for methods of administration of the law that are reasonably calculated to insure the full payment of unemployment compensation when determined under the State law to be due to claimants. The standard in this part is issued to implement section 303(a)(1) in regard to promptness in the payment of unemployment benefits to eligible claimants.

(b) Although the standard applies to the promptness of all benefit payments and the criteria apply directly to the promptness of first benefit payments, it is recognized that adequate performance is contingent upon the prompt determination of eligibility by the State as a condition for the payment or denial of benefits. Accordingly, implicit in prompt performance with respect to benefit payments is the corresponding need for promptness by the State in making determinations of eligibility. However, applicable Federal laws provide no authority for the Secretary of Labor to determine the eligibility of individuals under a State law.

(b) Scope. (1) The standard in this part applies to all State laws approved by the Secretary of Labor under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, 26 U.S.C. 3304), and to the administration of the State laws.

(2) The standard specified in §640.4 applies to all claims for unemployment compensation. The criteria for State compliance in §640.5 apply to first payments of unemployment compensation under the State law to eligible claimants following the filing of initial claims and first compensable claims.


§ 640.2 Federal law requirements.

(a) Conformity. Section 303(a)(1) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 503(a)(1), requires that a State law include provision for:

Such methods of administration * * * as are found by the Secretary of Labor to be reasonably calculated to insure full payment of unemployment compensation when due.

(b) Compliance. Section 303(b)(2) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 503(b)(2), provides in part that:

Whenever the Secretary of Labor, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency charged with the administration of the State law, finds that in the administration of the law there is:

(1) * * *

(2) a failure to comply substantially with any provision specified in subsection (a) of this section;

the Secretary of Labor shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Secretary of