

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
DIVISION OF JUDGES
ATLANTA BRANCH OFFICE

CASE FARMS OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.

and

Case Nos. 11-CA-21378
11-CA-21379

WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA WORKERS' CENTER

Rossetta Lane, Esq. for the General Counsel.
Charles Roberts III, Esq. (Constangy, Brooks & Smith, LLC) of Winston-Salem, NC, for the Respondent.
Mr. Francisco Risso for the Charging Party.

DECISION

Statement of the Case

JOHN H. WEST, Administrative Law Judge. This case was tried in Morganton, North Carolina, on July 16, 17, and 18, 2007. The charges in Case Nos. 11-CA-21378 and 11-CA-21379 were filed by Western North Carolina Workers' Center on November 2, 2006.¹ A consolidated complaint was issued on March 30, 2007. It alleges that Case Farms of North Carolina, Inc. (Respondent) violated Section 8(a)(1) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (Act), by threatening employees with calling immigration and by terminating employees Claudia Zamora and Luz Rodriguez because the employees engaged in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and in order to discourage employees from engaging in such concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection. Respondent denies violating the Act as alleged in the above-described complaint.

On the entire record, including my observation of the demeanor of the witnesses, and after considering the briefs filed by General Counsel and the Respondent on September 17, 2007², I make the following

Findings of Fact

I. Jurisdiction

The Respondent, a North Carolina corporation, processes poultry at its facility in Morganton, where it annually sells and ships from its Morganton plant, products valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to points outside the State of North Carolina. The Respondent admits and I find that it is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6),

¹ All dates are 2006 unless otherwise indicated.

² Counsel for General Counsel's unopposed Motion for an extension of time to file briefs from August 23 to September 17, 2007 was granted.

and (7) of the Act.

II. Alleged Unfair Labor Practices

Facts

5

On October 27 a number of Respondent's employees engaged in a work stoppage. Before October 27 the employees were provided with an unlimited number of latex gloves daily by the Employer. The employees had been placing the gloves in trash containers when they went on break or to the restroom, and they were given a new pair of gloves, at no charge to them, when they returned to the work area. Before October 27 the employees had complained that the quality of the gloves had fallen off. Also, customers complained that they were finding pieces of the latex gloves in the product and they advised Respondent that they would not continue to purchase Respondent's product unless the problem was remedied. Respondent purchased better latex gloves which cost more and Respondent decided to only provide three pairs of these gloves to the employees daily. If an employee required more than three pairs of gloves on a given day, the employee had to pay 50 cents to Respondent for each additional pair of gloves. The employees received notification of the change in policy on October 27.

10

15

20

Members of management spoke to the employees on October 27 telling them to go back to work or leave the plant. The employees did neither. The message was repeated during the morning and eventually the employees were advised that the police were going to be summoned. Subsequently the police arrived and the employees were escorted off Respondent's property.

25

30

35

40

Miguel Cua, who is a Human Resource supervisor, testified that on October 27 there was a work stoppage beginning at 8:15 a.m., and he and Armando Campos, Respondent's Human Resources Director, went down to the production floor to find out what was going on; that the employees complained about the change in the glove policy; that the employees were told that the new glove policy was not going to be changed; that management decided to give the employees time to cool off; that later the employees were asked again to go back to work but the employees said that they were not going back to work until the Company changed the glove policy back to the old policy; that the employees were informed that the policy was not going to be changed back and they had 10 minutes to go back to work; that a second warning was given to the employees who were told to go back to work or leave; that the employees refused; that after the third attempt to get the employees to work or leave, management told the employees that if they did not work or leave they were trespassing and management would call the police; that the police had the employees leave the Respondent's property; that by about 11:30 a.m. more than 250 employees had left the plant; that during the 3 hour period he did not say anything about calling Immigration; and that he addressed the employees as a group.

45

50

On cross-examination Cua testified that during the work stoppage management told the employees 'don't yell, don't yell, be calm' (transcript page 478); that there was no violence when the police came; and that the employees left when they were told to by the police.

When called by Counsel for General Counsel, Victoria Soto King, Respondent's Human Resource Director, testified that Respondent had been having a problem with the latex gloves it used for some time; that eventually a vendor of a better quality latex glove was located; that the better latex gloves cost the Respondent more and it was decided to give Respondent's employees three pairs per day and after that the employees would have to pay for the additional pairs of gloves they used; that she thought the cost to employees for additional gloves was 45 cents a pair; that employees have to purchase the files they use to sharpen their knives; that on October 27 the employees engaged in a walk out because they were not going to get as many

free gloves as they used to; that she arrived at the plant at about 11:30 a.m. on October 27; that the police arrived at the plant and removed more than 250 employees on October 27; and that later that day when the employees returned to the plant to pick up their paychecks she told the employees that she did not understand why they had to walk out.

5

A newspaper article, General Counsel's Exhibit 2 (Respondent's Exhibit 13 is the computerized copy of the newspaper article.) was published on Sunday October 29 about the walkout and two employees who spoke to representatives of the press about the reasons for the walkout, viz. Zamora and Rodriguez, were named in the published article. As here pertinent, the newspaper article reads as follows:

10

More than 100 workers at Case Farms walked off the job Friday morning after what they call a months-long attempt at correcting problems inside the factory.

15

Company officials say the incident Friday was caused by new gloves introduced into the work area.

Workers say the gloves aren't their only problem.

20

....

'We've been talking for several months about problems at the plant, but the company hasn't responded to our needs,' says spokesperson Luz Rodriguez, through interpreter Francisco Russo, director of North Carolina Worker's Center.

25

Thursday, the company announced that each worker would get three pair of gloves that should last them the entire day, she says.

30

The workers were told that they would be charged 75 cents for each additional pair, she says.

She says workers normally use six or seven pairs a day because the gloves break.

35

There was no limit on gloves before Friday, Rodriguez says.

....

Gloves aren't the only reason workers say they decided to stage a strike.

40

Pregnant women used to be able to take 13 weeks off when they had their babies but the company now expects new mothers to come back in a month, Rodriguez says.

45

'It had to do with a lot of things, ' she says. 'We decided to say, "No more." '

Claudia Patricia-Zamora says the workers at Case Farms are routinely told to ignore notes from doctors about work restrictions when they've been injured on the job.

50

....

Rodriguez testified that she worked at Respondent from October 9, until October 31; that

5 she cut and deboned chicken legs using a knife or scissors in area 1145; that on October 27
when she arrived at work at 8 a.m. she was given three pairs of gloves for the day and if she
needed more, she would have to pay for them; that in the past she was able to get as many
pairs of gloves as she needed during the day; that she then went to the ladies locker room
10 where the ladies were talking about a strike or work stoppage; that she and the other ladies
went to the work area; that all of the workers were standing; that she told the workers that if they
stick together maybe the company would reduce the price a little bit of the gloves; that
supervisor "Chepino" (Jose Hernandez) asked her why she was screaming at the people,
yelling at the people, and she told him that she was not yelling but rather she was simply
15 defending the employees' rights as workers; that the employees in area 1145 decided to go to
area 1110; that when she was in area 1110 Campos came and spoke to the employees; that
Campos asked her why she was yelling or screaming, she told Campos she was not screaming
or yelling she was just simply defending the employees' rights and defending her co-workers
because it was not just what the company was doing to them, it was not fair; that Campos then
20 told her that what she was doing was not right, if she had a problem, she should go to the office
and talk to him, and it was her fault that the people had stopped working in area 1110; that then
supervisor Miguel (Rodriguez did not know his last name) came and told the employees to leave
the company and the police were coming; that employees told Miguel that they were not afraid
of the police and Miguel said "Well, if you're not afraid of the police, then don't make us call -
25 have to call Immigration" (transcript page 157); that then the police came and the employees
went to the cafeteria; that then the police made the employees leave Respondent's property;
that the employees went to a local church and she was chosen to speak to the press; that she
told the press that it was not fair what the Company was doing because the Company was
charging the employees for everything; that she returned to the plant later that day to pick up
30 her paycheck; that King told the employees "Aren't you - aren't you ashamed to come pick up
your check after you - after what you have done? Why did you make such a scandal for a pair of
gloves? Why did you force us to call the police?" (transcript pages 160 and 161); that an
employee said that they had only come for their paycheck and they did not want to hear what
King had to say; that King then said "well, be quiet, and if you don't want to work here, leave.
35 You are a dog, or it could be a bitch. I don't - it's the same word in Spanish" (transcript page
161); and that then King told the employees to be quiet and leave and "not to force her to call
the police or immigration because I will send you back to your country" (Id.).

35 On cross-examination Rodriguez testified that on October 27 at about 8 a.m. there were
about 300 employees who were not working at that time; that 3 hours later, or about 11 a.m.,
the employees were finally made to leave the plant; that only once did Campos and Cua ask the
employees to either leave the facility or go back to work; and that at some point Miguel or some
other supervisor told the employees that if they did not leave the plant the police were going to
40 be called.

40 King testified that about 90 percent of Respondent's employees at the involved plant are
Hispanic, with 89 percent of Guatemalan descent; that in 2006 the employees began
complaining about the latex gloves, indicating that they were thinner than they had been using
and that the finger tips were no longer rough which made it more difficult to hold the product;
45 that a customer complained that it was finding pieces of the yellow latex gloves on the product
and it indicated that if Respondent wanted the customer to buy the product, Respondent would
have to make sure that the extraneous material was not on the product; that it was decided to
use blue latex gloves; that the employees indicated that the new gloves were of the same
thickness of the gloves they used before they became thinner; that it was decided that three
50 pairs of the new gloves would be supplied to employees each day and if the employees needed
additional gloves they would have to pay 50 cents for each pair; that on Thursday October 26
she posted a notice to employees advising them that if they needed more than three pairs of

gloves a day, it would cost them 50 cents a pair³; that when she arrived at the plant on October 27 at about 11 a.m. she saw the police cars around the plant and Campos told her what was going on; that on the afternoon of October 27 when the employees returned to the plant to pick up their paycheck, she asked them "why did you leave, why did you feel that you had to stop like that" (transcript page 336); that some employees told her that they were not there to talk about issues, they were there just to pick up their paycheck; that she then told the employees present "[w]hen you come back on Monday, you're going to get your three pairs of better yellow gloves you wanted. If you want to work, come to work. But if you don't want to work, don't even bother coming" (transcript page 337); that she did not say to the employees don't make me call Immigration or I'm going to call Immigration, and she did not call the employees dogs or bitches in Spanish; and that she did not ask employees "are you ashamed to pick up your paychecks." (transcript page 396)

On October 30 Respondent's employee known at that time as Zamora went to the medical or first aid station in Respondent's plant, and presented a note, General Counsel's Exhibit 3, from Table Rock Family Medicine which is dated "10-26-06" and which prescribed "Light work or no work ... [concerning left] arm for one week." Zamora is actually an alias for Evodia Gonzalez Dimas. Dimas had worked for Respondent since 1999. However, the Social Security Administration (SSA) advised Respondent by letter that the social security number that Dimas was using was not a valid social security number for her. Subsequently, Dimas provided Respondent with identification (a permanent resident card) as Zamora and a social security card for Zamora, who had a different birth date than the one originally provided to Respondent by Dimas. Respondent's Exhibit 6. On September 8 Respondent terminated Dimas, Respondent's Exhibit 12, and on September 11 Dimas was hired and received orientation as a new employee named Zamora, Respondent's Exhibits 16 and 14. When Dimas went to Respondent's medical station on October 30 posing as Zamora, she was still a probationary employee since Zamora had not completed her 90-day probationary period. On October 30 Dimas posing as Zamora complained to the medical assistant in Respondent's plant about her left arm and shoulder. The Respondent had not sent Dimas to the clinic from which she had the medical note. Zamora was referred to Respondent's Human Resource department. Dimas posing as Zamora was advised that since she was a probationary employee, Respondent would not accommodate her request. Dimas posing as Zamora was terminated on October 30.

When called as a witness by General Counsel, King testified that Ken Wilson in public relations at Respondent e-mailed her a copy of the newspaper article about the work stoppage in which Dimas, referred to in the article as Zamora, and Rodriguez were quoted, Respondent's Exhibit 13; that Raul Herrera, who began working for Respondent on October 9, 2006, is Respondent's Safety Manager and is responsible for Respondent's medical station and Workers' Compensation, met with her about Zamora's complaint regarding her left arm; that Dimas a.k.a. Zamora had worked for Respondent since 1999; that on Friday September 9 Dimas brought to Respondent identification documentation as Zamora; that on the following Monday Dimas began working as Zamora; that when Dimas was hired as Zamora, she was given new employee orientation, a different employee number, a new employee seniority date, her job and her supervisor remained the same but Dimas' pay was reduced to that of a starting

³ See page 8 of Respondent's Exhibit 5, which indicates, inter alia, that starting on October 27 every production employee will receive 3 pair of gloves every morning at no cost to them - blue for the leg debone personnel and the new better yellow gloves for the employees in the rest of the departments, and that if the employees need more gloves other than the 3 free pairs provided daily, they must buy them at their own expense which will be the price of .50 cents per pair.

employee; that when a new employee begins working at Respondent they often experience pain in their arms and their wrists from the repetitive motion of the work; that Herrera will work with the employees for a couple of weeks to alleviate the pain until they get better; that sometimes Herrera has to move the employee to a different job where they are not using that particular part of their body for a couple of weeks; and that Herrera does this for all employees, including new employees.

When called as a witness by General Counsel, Herrera testified that when an employee comes to the medical station complaining about an ache or pain the situation is evaluated; that everything is treated as work related initially just in case; that new employees especially experience aches and pains; that if a new employee complains about an ache or pain, they can, after evaluation, be used in different areas of the plant within their department for a while so that they are not aggravating the injury; that in October Zamora, who worked on the deboning line, came to the medical station and told him that she was experiencing pain in her left shoulder, arm and wrist; that on October 30 Zamora presented him with a note from the Table Ridge Family Medicine clinic, which is one of the clinics which Respondent refers its employees to, calling for light duty or no work for left arm for one week (General Counsel's Exhibit 3, a Table Rock Family Medicine note, indicates "Light work or no work ... [see left] arm for one week"); that in this instance Respondent had not referred Zamora to the clinic; that Zamora had been in the plant aid office several times complaining about this pain in her shoulder, arm, and wrist, and most of the time Respondent would give her some medication that would help relieve the swelling and pain; that on October 30 when Zamora came to him with the medical note he told her that he would help her and he gave her a sling for her arm; that at the time of her evaluation he told supervisor Jose Hernandez to give Zamora a job where she did not have to use her left arm; that 95 percent of the time he has employees who come to him with an injury or pain of some sort write a statement about it; that he could only recall one other time when he had an employee, Antonio Jackson, draft a statement regarding how he was injured; that he did not tell Zamora individually when she came to the medical station that there are better ways to take care of a problem than a work stoppage; that on October 27, as part of the management team speaking to employees engaged in the work stoppage, he did tell all of the assembled employees together that there is a better way to take care of problems than a work stoppage; that his office did not schedule Zamora's appointment at the clinic; that at the time he did not know Zamora under any other name; and that when he determined that the injury was not related to Workers' Compensation he sent Zamora to Human Resources.

In her examination of Herrera, Counsel for General Counsel introduced General Counsel's Exhibits 4 through 19, which show that Respondent gave light duty to a number of employees who suffered an injury, pains, aches, or cysts. Some of these employees who were given light duty had not yet completed their probationary (90days) period and some of these were given light duty after Zamora was terminated. Indeed one of the probationary employees who received light duty after Zamora was terminated had a non-work related injury.

Dimas testified that she began working at Respondent in January 1999; that in September 2006 when she changed her identification from Dimas to Zamora she did not miss any work in that she changed her identity on Friday and on Monday she was called Zamora; that when she became Zamora her job and supervisor, Pedro Shank, did not change but she was paid less for doing the same work; that she worked on a deboning line, cutting chicken legs with a knife or scissors; that when she works with scissors if the chicken leg was not cut properly by the person on the line ahead of her using the knife, she returns the chicken to the person who originally had the responsibility of making the necessary cut with the knife; that she uses her right hand for the knife and scissors and she wears a metal glove on her left hand; that on October 26 she had to leave work early because her left arm hurt her a lot; that she went to

see "Doctor Mike," who is a physicians assistant at Table Ridge Family Medicine clinic; that the physicians assistant asked her if Respondent had sent her and she told him no; that prior to seeing the physicians assistant she told the nurses aide in the plant that she was going to the doctor because her arm hurt a lot; that the nurses aide told her that she would have to speak
5 with King and she did speak with King but she could not remember exactly when; that on October 27 she participated in the work stoppage over Respondent's new policy regarding work gloves; that she was also upset about Respondent's policies regarding absences and doctor notes; that she overheard Rodriguez, who was a new employee, tell her co-workers not to be afraid because management would not do anything to them; that supervisor Hernandez and
10 Campos then told Rodriguez to be quiet and they asked her why she was screaming so much ; that the employees were told to go to the cafeteria, that the police would be summoned, and the police did come to the plant; that many of Respondent's employees left Respondent's property and met at a church; that newspaper people came to the church and she spoke with them through an interpreter; that later in the day on October 27 she and other employees went back
15 to Respondent's plant to get their belongings and their paychecks; that while they were at Respondent's plant, King told the employees that if they wanted to go back to work on Monday the work was there but the new policy regarding the gloves would remain the same; that on October 30 she told supervisor Hernandez that she had to go to the nurses station; that at the nurses station she spoke with nurse Morgan and Herrera; that Herrera told her that he had
20 spoken with King, they decided to take her case, they were willing to help her, and he had a present for her, namely a sling; that she gave Herrera the note she had from the Table Ridge Family Medicine clinic; that she told Herrera that Dimas went to the clinic and not Zamora; that Herrera then said that he did not like it when people played with him; that Herrera put her arm in the sling, and he told her not to take it off for any reason and that the doctor's note would be
25 respected; that Herrera told Hernandez to put Zamora on a job where she would be using only one hand; that she picked up chicken legs which had fallen between the lines and she placed them in a box; that she worked for 2 hours and then went on a break; that she worked for 30 minutes more picking up chicken legs off the floor when Herrera told her to go to his office; that Herrera told her that he was new at Respondent and needed her to help him so he could help
30 her; that he asked her to draft a statement indicating when she started work and when her arm started hurting her; that while she was writing the statement, General Counsel's Exhibit 22,⁴ Herrera said that the employees committed a grave error when they stopped work on October 26; that she told Herrera that she realized that but she did not like the way King treated her; that she spoke with Herrera for about 2 hours; that she told Herrera that ever since King and
35 Campos came to Respondent changes were made, they were not made in favor of the employees but rather they were made in favor of the company; that she went back to work and about 5:30 or 6 p.m. Hernandez told her to go to King's office; that it was just her and King in the office but Campos came in at one point; that King told her that she had discussed the matter with Herrera and she would have to let her go because she could not work with just one hand
40 and they did not have work for her with just one hand; that she told King that she was willing to do any other work even if it did hurt her; that King told her that she could not do anything for her; that she asked for a termination slip and King said she was not going to give it to her; that King called and told Herrera to accompany Dimas to get her belongings; that during her employment with Respondent she once took a leave of absence for 4 months; and that when King
45 discharged her King did not tell her that she could reapply to work at Respondent's plant in 30 days.

On cross-examination Dimas testified that the birth date of Zamora was different than

50 ⁴ In here statement, Dimas indicated that the metal glove she wore on her left hand for the half day that she used the knife weighed a lot when it was full of grease or fat.

the one she originally gave when she originally went to work for Respondent in 1999, Respondent's Exhibit 1⁵; that the Social Security number she gave to the Respondent in 1999 was given to her by a friend; that she was not authorized to work in the United States in 1999; that she was never terminated by the Respondent before October 2006; that in September 2006
 5 King told her that she would have to be terminated as Dimas and rehired as new employee Zamora; that she signed an employment application as Zamora; that her pay was reduced; that she bought the papers so that she could work as Zamora; that on October 27 Hernandez told employees to go back to work about three times; and that on October 30, even though she was not asking for a leave of absence, King told her that she could not give her a leave of absence
 10 because she was a new employee.

On redirect Dimas testified that she gave her Zamora papers to Campos and not King; that while she signed the Zamora application, General Counsel's Exhibit 23, she did not fill it out; that King filled out the Zamora application and King asked her to sign it; that while she
 15 worked as Dimas at Respondent, her job was changed for one week to accommodate a thumb she cut at home; and that she regretted changing her name to Zamora "because it didn't do me any good." Transcript page 148.

King testified that the probationary period is 90 days; that probationary employees do not
 20 receive any benefits and they are not eligible for any kind of medical or personal leave; that since 2004 when someone applies for a job Respondent has telephoned the SSA to check that there is a match with the social security number given, the name, and the birth date; that periodically Respondent gets letters from SSA indicating that there are certain mismatches; that she prints two copies of the letter, gives one to the employee involved, and has the employee
 25 sign the other copy to show that the employee was given the letter; that the SSA letter indicates that the employer cannot assume that the individual in question is illegal and the employer cannot take adverse action against the involved employee; that she gave such a letter to Dimas and Dimas subsequently gave new documentation to Campos⁶; that she did check the Social Security number to make sure that it belong to somebody named Zamora; that Dimas was
 30 terminated on September 8, 2006, Respondent's Exhibit 12; that Dimas, under the name Zamora, was hired on September 11, 2006, Respondent's Exhibits 14, 15, and 16; that late in

⁵ Respondent's Exhibit 1 includes copies of the Resident Alien card, the Social Security card, and the State of North Carolina DMV Identification card Dimas gave to the Respondent in
 35 1999 when she was first hired.

⁶ Dimas gave Campos a permanent resident card and a social security card, Respondent's Exhibit 6. The permanent resident card has the picture of Dimas on it but it has the name of Claudia Patricia Zamora with a birth date of 12/06/81. The card also indicates that the holder has been a resident since 04/20/01. The social security card bears the name of Claudia Patricia
 40 Zamora. The documentation that Dimas originally gave to the Respondent, Respondent's Exhibit 1, includes a resident alien card, and a State of North Carolina identification card. Both the Dimas resident alien card and the State of North Carolina identification card give Dimas's birth date as 11/01/79. The numbers on the two social security cards Dimas gave to
 45 Respondent at different times are not the same. In other words, with the documentation Dimas gave to the Respondent in September 2006, as far as Respondent was concerned, she changed her name, birth date, and social security number. The numbers of the new social security card bear no resemblance whatsoever to the old social number. Indeed, the old one began with the number 5 while the new one began with the number 6. King testified that she did not ask Dimas about these changes and Campos did not testify at the trial herein. With the
 50 changes, Dimas incredibly reversed the aging process by over two years. Yet no one at Respondent saw fit to ask her how she accomplished this feat?

the afternoon of October 30, 2006 Herrera told her "[t]hat Evodia had a personal doctor's note that I needed to deal with" (transcript page 352); that for anything work related the nurses station would schedule a doctor's appointment; that she has advised supervisors that any other doctor's note should be referred to Human Resources; that the Respondent does "not
5 contemplate personal doctor's note restrictions [regarding light duty or proposed restricted duty] at all, none" (transcript page 353); that Respondent allows light duty or restricted duty in work related, workers compensation cases; that if employees who are not probationary come to her with a note proposing a personal restriction that employee can take medical leave or personal leave; that it is best that employees who have not finished their probationary period and who
10 have a proposed personal restriction, that they just quit and come back when they are better; that anyone can reapply after 30 days; that she understood that Zamora's appointment was not one that either Herrera or his office scheduled; that she called Zamora to her office and told her that Respondent did not have a job for her because she had a restriction in her personal doctor's note; that Campos and Herrera were in her office at the time; that she told Zamora that
15 if she had been there more than 90 days she would have options but Respondent could not accommodate her restrictions, and, therefore, Respondent did not have a job for her; that on Monday morning, October 30, she did see Zamora's name in the newspaper article emailed to her by Wilson, Respondent's Exhibit 13, but that had nothing to do with Zamora's termination; that she probably printed a copy of the email but she did not have a copy of the actual
20 newspaper itself; and that she has had other employees since she has been at Respondent within their probationary period who had personal restrictions that she has been unable to accommodate. King sponsored Respondent's Exhibits 28 [A probationary employee, Carlos Algarin, could not work until his next medical evaluation and he was not eligible for leave of absence (LOA).], 29 (A probationary employee, Marie Vincente, could not work in a cold
25 environment and she was not eligible for LOA), and 30 (A probationary employee, Ronald Romero, could not work until his next medical evaluation and he was not eligible for LOA).

On cross-examination King testified that she was employed with Respondent when Algarin requested a leave of absence; that Algarin was requesting to be out of work completely,
30 the doctor told Algarin that he could not work until his next medical evaluation, and she did not know how long it would be until Algarin's next medical evaluation; and that Romero was asking to be out of work until his further medical evaluation and he was not asking for any type of special accommodations; that Vincente was requesting a restriction not to work in a cold area and the doctor did not give a particular time frame that she was not supposed to work in a cold
35 environment; that as memorialized by General Counsel's Exhibit 25, Dimas a/k/a Zamora received a probationary increase in pay back up to eight dollars an hour after she had been working at Respondent for less than a month as Zamora; that Dimas a/k/a Zamora never requested a leave of absence; that she did not review Dimas' personnel file before testifying at the trial herein; that there are documents in Dimas' personnel file which indicate that she
40 received leave of absences throughout her employment; that Dimas is not an argumentative employee and she did anything she, King, asked her to do; and that when Dimas a/k/a Zamora brought the medical note on October 30 she would have been eligible for a leave of absence if she had not been a probationary employee.

When called by the Respondent Herrera testified that he was called to the nurses station about 8:15 a.m. on October 30; that at the time Morgan was in charge of the nurses station; that Morgan told him that Respondent was treating Zamora for what is called evaluation; that he knew about it the week before; that he asked Zamora what was wrong; that he told Zamora that he had something to help her out and he gave her a sling to immobilize her arm; that he told
50 Zamora that she was going to have to wear the sling throughout the day; that he called Hernandez and told him that he needed to find a job where Zamora could use one arm; that after he gave Zamora the sling and told her that she would be working under restrictions, she

5 told him that her arm had been hurting for some time and she gave him a medical note; that neither he nor the nurse scheduled that medical appointment; that for workers' compensation injuries either he or the nurse schedules the doctor's appointment; that he checked how long Zamora had worked for Respondent and discovered that she had not been there very long; that he had Zamora come to his office and he asked her to draft a statement regarding what caused the injury, how, when, and why it happened; that Zamora gave him her statement (General Counsel's Exhibit 22 translated at transcript pages 123-124); that he sent Zamora back to work and he then reviewed her statement; that the statement showed differences in time, it showed differences in when her injury happened, when she reported it, and how long she had been injured (The statement reads in part as follows: "The pain began when I was about eight (8) months doing the second cut. I started working on the 6th of February 2003."); that when he looked at Zamora's hire date again he realized that there was an issue and he brought the note back to Human Resources so they could evaluate it; that in his conversations with Zamora that day he did not say (1) anything about the walk out that had occurred on the previous Friday, (2) employees had made a grave error, (3) we've taken your case per Victoria, and (4) I have a gift for you; that Zamora did not say it is not Christmas; that he was present when Zamora was terminated; that King told Zamora that she was not eligible for LOA and the Respondent did not accommodate any personal restrictions; that he walked Zamora out of the plant; that as he escorted her out, she threw the sling in his face, said that he cheated her out of her job, and called him "benteto!" which means stupid or something like that; that regarding some injuries he did not know whether they were work-related or nonwork-related and he works with the employee until it is determined whether the injury is work-related or not; that with respect to General Counsel's Exhibit 4, (a) Donald Gene Allen had non-work related injury and he received 5 days on job restriction, (b) Antonio Rico Jackson had a non-work related injury and was given 8 days job restriction, (c) Dorothy Gladden had a non-work related injury and had other recordable cases, and (d) Janice Elaine Jordan had a non-work related injury and was given 8 days on job restriction; that Allen, Jackson, Gladden, and Jordan were all provided restricted duty while he was setting up appointments for Respondent to determine whether their injuries were work-related or not; that Zamora was different because she gave him a personal note and

35 Because the red flag again. If we - If I - if I don't have any red flags on a - on an injury, once again we treat all injuries as they were work-related and then we go from there. With Claudia Zamora, there was a red flag. There was a date of hire, then an injury date, and that's what caused for me to investigate. [Transcript page 504]

40 On cross-examination Herrera testified that Morgan is not a registered or licensed practical nurse but rather she is a CNA (apparently meaning a certified nursing assistant); that Zamora came to the nurse's station with a pain in her left shoulder, arm, wrist, and hand; that after she gave him a written statement he escorted Zamora to King's office; that he told King what was going on; that King did not tell him at that time that Zamora had worked since 1999 at the plant as Dimas; that he was on the plant floor on October 27 during the work stoppage; that he was part of the group of managers who were trying to calm things down; that he and the other managers were telling employees "don't yell, don't yell, calm down" (transcript page 510); that after several attempts to get the employees to go back to work, the employees were told that the authorities were going to be called; and that he never sent Zamora to the doctor to be evaluated for her arm because she never gave him the opportunity to because Zamora went to the doctor first.

50 Respondent experienced mechanical problems on line 16 in the deboning department on October 31, 2006. The employees on that line, who were not experienced employees, were moved to line 12 in the deboning department. Among them were Rodriguez, who had been

hired by Respondent just a couple of weeks before that, and employee Dominique Johnson, who had been hired in March 2006. As here pertinent, Rodriguez and Johnson were positioned on the line so that Johnson first made a cut with a knife and then Rodriguez, using only scissors, engaged in a follow up procedure. Johnson was not making the cut properly which
5 meant that Rodriguez could not further process the product moving to her from Johnson. Indeed, Johnson's failure to do her job properly affected not only Rodriguez ability to perform her job but it affected at least one other employee beyond Rodriguez on the line, namely Pedro Luis Ronda, who also worked with scissors. Rodriguez returned the product to Johnson to rework it. Rodriguez did this on more than one occasion. Johnson and Rodriguez then
10 exchanged words and Johnson, without permission from a supervisor, walked away from the line. Human Resources then became involved in this matter. Johnson, Rodriguez, and Rhonda were interviewed, and they gave written statements to Human Resources. Respondent's Exhibits 20, 24 and 22, respectively. Supervisor Daniel Raymundo also gave a written statement to Human Resources with respect to what he allegedly witnessed. Respondent's
15 Exhibit 21. Rodriguez, who testified that she cannot read in English, signed a statement written in English by King. General Counsel's Exhibit 25. The statement indicates that Rodriguez threw product. Rodriguez was terminated. Respondent takes the position that Rodriguez was terminated for throwing product when she gave Johnson back the product to rework or cut properly. According to Respondent, throwing product warrants termination.

20 Johnson did not testify at the trial herein.

When called by Counsel for General Counsel, King testified that Johnson was discharged in 2007 for absences; that Johnson was a tall and heavy set woman; that Johnson
25 was not a Hispanic employee and she did not speak Spanish; that Johnson had to be coached a lot because the other employees thought she was rude; that Johnson did not get along with the other employees; that Johnson came across as a bully, she intimidated other workers, and was disrespectful toward supervisors; that Johnson was often late for work and sometimes she forgot to clock in; that Johnson refused to do what a United States Department of Agriculture
30 inspector directed her to do; that on October 31 Johnson came to her office; that prior to Johnson coming to her office neither supervisor Raymundo nor supervisor Hernandez told her that there was a problem on the involved line; that Johnson told her that Rodriguez, who was making a cut following the cut Johnson was making, told Johnson that she did not know how to cut the chicken right; that Johnson gave a statement to her and in it Johnson indicated that she
35 told Rodriguez that nobody was going to tell her that she could not cut the chicken right; that Johnson told her that the other employee had cussed at her in English; that Johnson, who was using a knife at the time, told her that she told Rodriguez "to come and fuck her up," transcript page 46; that when Johnson left the line she did not tell her supervisor that she was leaving;
40 that employees do not need to get permission to leave a line to see her if they feel threatened or intimidated even if a supervisor is present on the line; that Rodriguez was a new employee and she was learning the job at the time of her discharge; that she did not recall any employee being issued a warning for walking off the line without permission during the time she worked at the involved plant; and that an employee can be disciplined for using profane language in the plant.

45 Rodriguez testified that when she came to work on Tuesday October 31 her line was not running and her supervisor told her that she was being sent to another line; that the supervisor on the line she was sent to was Raymundo; that her task was to remove the fat from the chicken with scissors and remove the bone; that to her right there was a lady who was new to the job and she could not do the work; that Johnson was to the right of the new employee; that the new
50 employee next to her was moved by Raymundo because she could not do the work; that she

took the new employee's place next to Johnson and there was a boy on her other side⁷; that Johnson, who is a tall women and was using a knife, was not doing her job correctly; that supervisor Raymundo was temporarily taking an employee's place on the line; that she told Raymundo to tell Johnson to do her job right because she could not work if Johnson was not doing her job right; that Raymundo did not pay any attention to her the first time; that she told Raymundo the second time to tell Johnson to do her work correctly because she could not do her job if Johnson did not do her work correctly; that then she saw Raymundo speaking to Johnson but she could not hear what was said since she was wearing earplugs; that she pushed the chicken which was piling up in front of her back to Johnson; that then Johnson threw a piece of chicken at her which hit her stomach; that Johnson looked at her with an ugly face, said some ugly things, and wanted to hit her with the knife she was holding; that Johnson raised the knife; that she ran behind the boy next to her; that Raymundo called someone on the radio and then told Johnson to go with him; that about 5 minutes later Hernandez told her to leave the line and stay in a room with a supervisor; that she told the supervisor what had happened and she was sent back to work; that later she was called to go off the line and she went to an office with Cua; that she was then sent to take her break; that she then went to King's office; that King told her "you are new and you already have problems with the employers - employees," transcript page 171; that she explained to King what had happened and King gave her a yellow sheet of paper to write out a statement; that she wrote out what happened and she signed it, General Counsel's Exhibit 24⁸; that King then told her that everything that she "wrote on that paper was pure lie" transcript page 173; that she told King that everything that she wrote was the truth, that she did not like to use lies, and she only liked to work with the truth; that King continued to say that everything that she had written was a lie and she should tell the truth; that King then told her that she was suspended and the company was going to look for witnesses; that she told King that she should go get witnesses; that King told her that she had talked badly - used bad language to the black lady and that she had thrown chicken at the black lady; that she told King that she should review the video tape; that she then went to the office with Miguel for 20 minutes; that then she returned to King's office; that Campos and Miguel were present, in addition to King; that King told her "to sign a paper [General Counsel's Exhibit 25] that said that I had abused a Company objects [sic] and that I threw chicken," transcript page 175); that while she cannot read English, she signed the document which was written in English⁹; that King made her sign the document; that King then told her that she was suspended for a few days because she had thrown Company objects and the Company wanted to find out what happened; that initially she refused to give King the Company ID; that King said "give me the ID so I don't have to be forced to call the police. She told me to give her the ID, I told her no, and

⁷ At one point Rodriguez testified that the boy was on her right hand side and Johnson was on her left hand side (transcript page 164).

⁸ The English translation reads as follows:

10-31-06

Today Tuesday

Something happens in the line that had a problem with the black lady. It started when she was in the third cut, she was not doing the chicken properly. For that reason I told her to make the chicken right but she started to yell at me in the line and raised a knife at me and she wanted to hit me and started strongly insulting me.

Only that happened today.

Luz Cordona Rodriguez

When I told her to calm down she screamed and threw the chicken at me. (stomach)

⁹ In the "NATURE OF THE INCIDENT" portion of the form the following appears: "Throwing product and cursing at another employee. Luz is being suspended pending investigation. She will return on Friday 9am (11-3-06) for job review."

5 she said don't make me have to call the Immigration and I can send you - so I'll send you to
your country," transcript page 177; that she then gave King the Company ID; that she saw a
newspaper on King's desk which was about the work stoppage because the picture in the
paper was of a man showing the glove; that she returned to King's office on November 3; that,
10 in addition to King, Campos and Miguel were present; that King told her that there was no work
for her; that she asked King if they were getting rid of her because of the work stoppage; that
King told her that she "didn't have the right to ask that question because I was only a worker
there," transcript page 179; that she repeated the question and King gave the same response;
and that she did not throw chicken at the black lady.

15 On cross-examination Rodriguez testified that during orientation one of the policies that
was reviewed was that throwing product was strictly prohibited; that she understood that any
employee who threw product would be terminated; that she did not know that there was a
mechanical problem on her original line on October 31; that she was having a problem with the
work of the black lady and the lady next to her; that while she complained to Raymundo about
20 the black lady she did not complain about the other lady who was new and not doing her job
correctly; that the other lady who was new was, like herself, Hispanic; that the new lady next to
her was using scissors and doing the same job she was doing; that since the new lady next to
her was not doing her work correctly, it meant that both legs were coming to her, Rodriguez, to
further process; that Raymundo was across from her and the black lady was to her right; that
the Hispanic lady who was new and not doing her job correctly was between her and the black
lady up until the time that Raymundo removed her; that she spoke to Raymundo across the line
about the black lady not doing her job correctly; that when she was in King's office King called
Miguel by radio and Miguel came to King's office; that by the time Miguel came to King's office
25 King had already told her that she was being suspended; that she did not want to give back her
ID because she did not do anything wrong, she did not throw any chicken; that she did not tell
King and Miguel that she had thrown any product; that she picked up the chicken because it
was piled up, and she handed the chicken to the black lady; that she took five pieces of chicken
and put it where the black lady was working; that she did not pick up the chicken but rather she
30 pushed it to the black lady who was working next to her; and that at no time did she actually lift
the chicken off the table.

35 Subsequently Rodriguez testified that she saw the plant floor on the video monitor in
King's office; that she saw a newspaper in King's office regarding the work stoppage and not an
8 and 1/2 X 11 printed e-mail sheet of paper; that King did translate into Spanish what she had
written in English on General Counsel's Exhibit 25; that King did not translate into Spanish the
handwriting at the top of General Counsel's Exhibit 25, namely "throwing product and cursing at
another employee"; that King simply told her to sign the paper acknowledging that she had
thrown product; that before she signed General Counsel's Exhibit 25 King told her that the
40 document indicated that she had thrown product; that King told her that she had abused the
Company; and that King did not tell her that she had thrown product, King told her that she had
abused the Company, or taken advantage of the Company.

45 On recross Rodriguez testified that King told her that General Counsel's Exhibit 25 said
that she had thrown an object of the Company; that King did not explain what General
Counsel's Exhibit 25 said but rather King simply told her that she had abused the Company; that
King told her that she had thrown an object of the Company, had abused Company property,
and had used bad language; that King told her to recognize that she had abused the Company
and to sign the document, General Counsel's Exhibit 25; and that she understood when she
50 was signing the document that she was being suspended for 3 days and being asked to come
back on November 3.

On redirect Rodriguez, who is about 5 feet tall, testified that she always did what King told her to do.

Raymundo testified that he supervises lines 11, 12, 13, and 14 in the Leg Debone department, which is department number 1145; that on Tuesday he saw a discussion, an argument between Rodriguez and Johnson; that at the time he was working on line 11 taking the place of a worker who went to the rest room; that neither Rodriguez nor Johnson, both of whom work on line 16, normally work for him; that there was a mechanical problem that day with line 16 so Rodriguez and Johnson were moved to line 12; that the employees working on line 12 face the employees who work on line 11, and the line runs between these two tables; that Johnson was working with a knife and Rodriguez was working with scissors; that there was one employee between Johnson and Rodriguez and while he could recall that the person was a new employee, he could not recall the employee's name; that he did not remove the employee who was working between Rodriguez and Johnson from the line that day; that neither before nor during her argument with Johnson, did Rodriguez say anything to him about the performance of either Johnson or the new lady who was working between her and Johnson; that he noticed that Johnson was passing the legs with a bad cut; that he saw Rodriguez take down the leg with the bad cut from the hook and "throws it to Dominique" (transcript page 208); that "the line comes from there, there was a person in the middle, then she takes it - the person in the middle takes it and throws it" (id); that Luz threw it with a side arm motion approximately three (3) yards; that while he demonstrated with a pen, standing up, that the object was held in his right hand and was thrown in a side arm motion across his chest to his left, Johnson was actually to the right of Rodriguez, and, therefore the product would have had to be thrown in the opposite direction than he demonstrated; that Rodriguez would have had to return the product to her right to Johnson; that when Rodriguez threw the leg in front of Johnson she started to argue; that Johnson told Rodriguez "come on, push me" (transcript page 212); that Rodriguez said something in English to Johnson; that he saw Rodriguez throwing the chicken leg two times; that the argument or discussion between Johnson and Rodriguez occurred when Rodriguez threw the leg the second time; that he did not see Johnson throwing any product that time of day; that Johnson left the line after the argument; that he called Hernandez who went to look for Johnson; that Hernandez called him and told him to take Rodriguez to Human Resources; that 5 or 10 minutes later he was asked to come to Human Resources and King asked him to write what he had seen¹⁰; that he did not verbalize to King what he had seen; that King then asked

¹⁰ The statement, which is in Spanish, was received as Respondent' Exhibit 21. As translated it reads as follows:

I was in Line 11 helping the person that asked me a favor to help because of the need of having to go to the bathroom. The people that are on Line 12, Artora moved them from Line 16 to Line 12. I only saw - I only saw that Ms. Dominique stopped passing the legs - stopped passing the legs badly cut and stopped passing - and stopped passing the leg without a cut and the other lady took or lowered the leg from the hook and threw it on the table of the line where the lady Dominique does the third cut. Dominique raised her voice and the other answered the same in a raised voice, and Dominique got angry - got angrier, raising her hands saying hit me or push me with a knife in the - in the hand. I didn't see if Dominique threw something of chicken - some part of the chicken to the woman because I was working. Daniel Raymundo. [Transcript pages 221 and 222]

After the statement was translated, it was submitted that instead of "stopped passing the leg" what was written meant "allowed to pass the legs that were badly cut and allowed to pass one leg that was not cut." (transcript page 222). The interpreter testified that she translated as she saw it written.

5 him to go back to the line and ask the employees if they saw what happened; that he spoke to five employees and only one, Ronda, said that he saw what happened; that he talked to Ronda in Human Resources with King present; that Ronda gave King a written statement and he told King what he saw; that Ronda told King that Johnson was doing a poor job and that Rodriguez "threw the legs back" (transcript page 216); that Ronda did not say whether he saw Johnson throw anything; that there are video cameras that point toward the lines 11 and 12, but the cameras are far from those lines in that they are in front of line 1 and beyond; that there are monitors in King's office that show "I think from Line 1 to Line 8" (transcript page 217); and that line 1 is closer to the camera than lines 11 and 12 are.

10 On cross-examination Raymundo testified that Johnson is a big women, very tall and very heavy; that when an employee leaves the line they are supposed to get someone to relieve them; that the employee has to have permission to leave the line or they can get a warning; that Ronda was next to Rodriguez on the line; that he did not know the name of the women who was
15 working between Johnson and Rodriguez, she still worked for the Respondent, but she told him that she did not see what happened; that he saw the legs that Rodriguez was taking down from the hook and they were not cut the way they were supposed to be cut by Johnson; that "after Johnson sent a leg through that wasn't properly cut, Rodriguez picked it up and put it back in front of Ms. Johnson to do the right cut" (transcript page 228); that Rodriguez was trying to do
20 her job and if Johnson was not doing her cut correctly, Rodriguez could not do the correct cut; that Rodriguez, who was using scissors, could not correct the mistakes Johnson, who was using a knife; that Rodriguez should have taken the product down and shown him the bad work that Johnson was doing; that he was not watching Johnson and Rodriguez, "I wasn't really looking because I was working for someone" (transcript page 229); that Joint Exhibit 1 is his diagram of
25 Lines 11 and 12 and who was working where on the day in question; that hooks and a conveyor belt for the finished product move between Lines 11 and 12; that the employees are about 2 feet from each other on lines 11 and 12; that he was approximately 3 feet from Johnson and at that distance he could tell that Johnson's cut was improper "[b]ut I was working, so I couldn't see specifically the cut that Ms. Johnson was doing" (transcript page 238); that when Johnson
30 raised her voice he called over to Johnson to calm down but in that moment she left the line; that he did not go to where Johnson and Rodriguez were on line 12 because he was working as relief on line 11; that in the affidavit he gave to the National Labor Relations Board (Board) he did not indicate that he called Hernandez but he did call Hernandez; that when Johnson got angry she turned to face Rodriguez holding the knife up pointing toward the ceiling and she told
35 Rodriguez to come hit her; that when the employee who he was relieving came back to the line he took the employees from line 12 to work somewhere else; that Johnson did not ask permission to leave the line; that all the other employees on line 11 stopped working; that he did not give Johnson a warning for walking off the line or for not making good cuts; that King did not ask him if he saw Johnson throw product; that he told King that Rodriguez gave the chicken
40 back to Johnson to make the right cut; that Johnson returned to the line about 30 or 40 minutes after her confrontation with Rodriguez; that Rodriguez never returned to the line; that he heard King ask Ronda if he saw Rodriguez throw product; and that King did not ask Ronda if he saw Johnson throw product.

45 On redirect Raymundo testified that in his affidavit to the Board he did indicate that Hernandez came over to the line and talked to him after about 2 minutes; that when he testified on cross-examination that Rodriguez "put" or "laid" the product back in front of Johnson he meant "[s]he threw it" (transcript page 251) in the manner he demonstrated earlier; that other employees have been terminated for throwing product; and that he did not know of anyone who
50 has thrown product who did not get terminated.

On recross Raymundo testified that with respect to the employees who were terminated

for throwing product, two of them were playing and a chicken landed on another employee; that the employees were throwing chicken at each other and the chicken hit the floor; that when the employees who are using the scissors on line 12 are finished their cut they place the product on the conveyor belt; and that Rodriguez did not place the product back in front of Johnson but
5 rather Rodriguez threw it in front of Johnson.

Subsequently Raymundo testified that an employee using scissors is expected to process about six chickens a minute and while he was performing this function on line 11 he was not attempting to engage in any supervisory functions; that notwithstanding that his
10 attention was focused on the continuously moving line he was working on, he noticed that there was a problem on the next line "[b]ecause you could see and hear that they were raising their voices" (transcript page 256); that he heard raised voices the second time; that he was aware of the first time because "I noticed when Ms. Luz [Rodriguez] threw the chicken in front of
15 Dominique [Johnson]" (id.); that while he was working on line 11 as relief he was performing a dual function in that he was acting both as an employee processing chickens and at the same time he still wore the supervisory hat in that he was watching other employees; that before the incident Rodriguez did not speak or attempt to speak to him about what was going on as far as the performance of Johnson was concerned; that he wore earplugs on October 31, 2006 when
20 he was working on line 11; that the fact that he was wearing ear plugs and the fact that there is "noise everywhere" (transcript page 257) makes it difficult to hear what is being said at the next table over; that he did not see Rodriguez go behind Ronda during the incident with Johnson; and that Rodriguez turned to face Johnson, and Rodriguez backed up but she did not go behind Ronda.

On further redirect Raymundo testified that he is not able to do more than six chickens a minute with scissors; and that he was about 6 feet from Johnson when the incident occurred.
25

Ronda testified that he recalled the incident between Johnson and Rodriguez; that he was working on line 12 that day next to Rodriguez, trimming legs; that Johnson was next to
30 Rodriguez¹¹; that Johnson was passing legs badly cut; that Rodriguez threw the leg on top of the table; that Johnson stopped and got angry; that Johnson said something in English, which he did not understand and Rodriguez responded with two words in English which he did not understand; that he then told Raymundo what was going on and about 10 minutes later
35 Raymundo came and got both Johnson and Rodriguez; that about 20 minutes later Raymundo asked him if he saw what happened and he told Raymundo that he did see what happened; that Raymundo asked him to go upstairs to King's office to tell her what happened; that he told King that the black lady had passed the legs poorly cut; and that he also told King:

[Johnson] passed the first leg and then she passed the second leg, and that's where Luz
40 took the leg and threw it on top of the table. And then the lady - the black lady stopped, turned to look at Luz, and Luz looked back at her. They both looked at each other. And the black woman started to speak, say things in English, and Luz responded some things also. [Transcript page 267]

Ronda further testified that during the incident in question Johnson had a chicken leg in her
45 hand and she threw it on top on the table because she was angry; that the black lady placed the knife, which she had in her hand, on top of the table; and that he told King what happened, King

¹¹ At this point counsel for the Respondent asked "[d]o you recall if there was another lady in
50 between Luz and Dominique" to which Ronda replied "[y]es, there were. But I don't remember who they were." (transcript page 265)

wrote out a statement, he reviewed it, and then he signed the statement, Respondent's Exhibit 22; and that the statement is accurate.

5 On cross-examination Ronda testified that when chicken that was badly cut came to Rodriguez she threw it normally but she threw it; that Rodriguez did not throw it strongly, "[s]he threw it normally, like slowly" (transcript page 277); that when the other leg came Rodriguez threw it softly on the table in front of Johnson; that after he is finished trimming the leg he throws it on the conveyor belt; that when the leg is poorly cut, he takes the leg and gives it to the person who was supposed to cut so that they can cut correctly; that he places the leg on the table in front of the person who was supposed to make the proper cut with the knife; that when Johnson became angry she put her knife on the table and she turned to face Rodriguez; that 20 minutes later both Johnson and Rodriguez left the line; and that when he spoke with King she asked him if he saw Johnson throw chicken.

15 Subsequently Ronda testified that after Johnson and Rodriguez had the verbal exchange he called Raymundo and told Raymundo what was going on, and "when ... [Raymundo] saw it they [Johnson and Rodriguez] were arguing" (transcript page 283); that he whistled at Raymundo who was on the other line ["either Line 11 or Line 10" (id.)] and he called Raymundo; that at the time Raymundo was talking and teaching the work to other workers; that 20 when he called Raymundo he saw what was happening and Raymundo came immediately to line 12; that he told Raymundo that the black lady was not working well; that when he told Raymundo this Johnson and Rodriguez had already argued; that the black lady was still on the line when he spoke with Raymundo; that Raymundo said that he would take care of it and then Raymundo spoke with the black lady; that he could not hear what Raymundo said to Johnson; 25 that he could not remember if the black lady continued to work on the line or if Raymundo took them off the line; that he thought that Rodriguez tried to get Raymundo's attention with respect to Johnson not doing her job properly; that on October 31, 2006 he had two conversations with Raymundo, namely when he told Raymundo Johnson was not doing her job properly and when Raymundo asked him if he saw what happened; that there are no vertical partitions dividing the table that he and the other employees were working at on line 12; that the long table is a flat surface where eight employees work; that there is nothing between one employee and another employee working at the table on line 12; that he told King that he saw the black lady throw chicken on top of the table; that King only asked him if Johnson had thrown a leg or a piece of meat; and that during the exchange Rodriguez did not attempt to get behind him so that he 35 would be between her and Johnson.

On recross Ronda testified "I told her [King] that Luz first threw a chicken leg and then the black lady threw also a chicken leg." (transcript page 292)

40 King testified that she tells employees that if they feel intimidated in any way, if they have a problem of any kind, they should come and see her and they will not get in any trouble; that it does not matter if they are on the line when they want to come to see her; that this has happened before and after October 31, 2006; that Respondent's Exhibit 2 is the employee handbook; that Good Manufacturing Practices are rules which are United States Department of 45 Agriculture regulated and which were developed basically for food safety; that Respondent's Exhibit 3 is a Power Point presentation Respondent shows to all of its employees; that page 12 of Respondent's Exhibit 3 indicates that "[t]hrowing product or any other item is PROHIBITED", and that "[a]ny person that violates this rule will be terminated immediately"¹²; that

50 ¹² This entry includes a picture of a chicken wing on the floor and a drawing of person throwing a pencil, both of which have an X over them.

Respondent's Exhibit 4 is the Power Point orientation presentation; that during her orientation Rodriguez signed on October 13, 2006 a Spanish rendition of "Good Manufacturing Practices & Operation Sanitation Procedures" which includes, inter alia, "23. Throwing product or any other item is PROHIBITED. Any person who violates this rule will be terminated immediately,"

5 Respondent's Exhibit 19; that on the morning of October 31 she became aware of a problem between Rodriguez and Johnson when Johnson, a large black lady who had had problems with Hispanic employees in the past, came to her office and told King her version of what happened between her and Rodriguez; that Johnson's "version of the story was apparently Luz [Rodriguez] wasn't happy with her cuts, and she started throwing the meat back at her.... and
10 by the second time when she threw meat back at her ... they engaged in ... [a] verbal confrontation" (transcript page 366); that she had Johnson write a statement about what happened¹³; that she then asked that Rodriguez be brought to her office; that Rodriguez "made it out to be that Dominique was the only one that had thrown product at her, that had cussed her out, that she wasn't doing her job right.... [Johnson] was not doing her job right and she was just
15 giving it back to her" (transcript page 368); that Rodriguez gave a written statement, General Counsel's Exhibit 24, which is described above; and that Raymundo

"told me he was right in front of them; that he saw the whole thing; that he saw Luz
20 throwing the - - in fact throwing the product at Dominique, and confirming the first story I heard that they had a verbal confrontation; that they had looked at each other, had faced each other, and that there was no physical contact. And he didn't see Dominique throw any product. [Transcript page 369]

King further testified that Raymundo gave a written statement, Respondent's Exhibit 21; that
25 she asked Raymundo to find out if any other employee saw what happened and he brought Ronda to her office; that Ronda told her that he saw Luz get mad at Dominique for not doing her job right and throwing the product back at her; that she asked Ronda if he saw Dominique throw product at Luz "and he told me no" (transcript page 371); that she helped Ronda write out a statement by asking him again what happened and he dictated while she wrote; that she gave
30 the statement to Ronda, he read it, she asked him if there were any changes, he said "no," and Ronda signed the statement; that at no point during her conversation with Ronda did he say anything about Johnson having thrown product; that she sent Ronda back to work, called Rodriguez back into her office, and told her that she was going to have to suspend her for throwing product; that while throwing product calls for immediate termination, she suspended
35 Rodriguez so she discuss the matter with Campo since she was not the one who makes the final decision about terminations; that when she told Rodriguez that she was suspended for throwing product Rodriguez asked her if Dominique was going to be suspended; that she prepared a document memorializing the suspension and she read the document in Spanish to

40 ¹³ Respondent's Exhibit 20. The statement, which was not offered for the truth of the matter asserted therein, reads as follows:

10-31-06

2nd cutter was not properly cutting and it was resulting in me getting behind and that
45 2nd cutter threw the 2nd leg at me. I said what are you doing. She said you can't cut. I said you ain't about 2 [sic] tell me I can't cut. She said Fuck you. I said come and fuck me up. I raise[d] my arms, she walk toward me with the scissors in her right hand. I backed up. The 1st cutter said what's going on. She turned back facing the cutting board. I walk[ed] off the line throw[ing] my cutting glove into the sink. Christian stop[ped] me and said where are you going. I said I' m not working no more. I come 2 [sic]
50 Victoria[']s office cause things was going to ... [escalate]

Johnson did not testify at the trial herein.

Rodriguez word for word, and then had Rodriguez sign the document; that she told Rodriguez to come back the following Friday for a job evaluation; that she did not tell Rodriguez that her version of the event was all lies; that she did not call Rodriguez any names; that Rodriguez was suspended because there had to be preparation for the job review, "[y]ou have to look at
5 whether the employee's probationary or not.... previous work history, attendance....., precedence, what has the Company done before, [and] consistency in any - in any human resource department is always the key" (transcript pages 377 and 378); that she "was pretty much told by Armando [Campos] and Charles who had been there for over 10 years now (apparently referring to Charles Rigdon, who is the Respondent's General Manager and who is
10 located in Morganton), that throwing product has always been termination, period. So there was no question in my mind then that Luz was going to be terminated" (transcript page 378); that Respondent's Exhibit 23, which is a payroll change notice that she prepared for Rodriguez dated November 3, 2006, gives as the reason for termination "Misconduct"; that misconduct could be anything; that she met with Rodriguez on Friday November 3, 2006 and she had
15 Raymundo present because Rodriguez had been so ugly toward her when she suspended Rodriguez; that Cua came into the meeting later because he was the one who was going to have to walk her out; that at the November 3 meeting she asked Rodriguez if she remembered that during orientation she was told that throwing product calls for termination and Rodriguez said "yes"; that she then told Rodriguez that she was terminated; that Rodriguez allegedly said
20 "tell me that you're suspending me because I'm with the Union" (transcript page 380); that she told Rodriguez that she was being terminated for throwing product; that Rodriguez again said "tell me you're terminating me because I'm with the Union"; that she told Rodriguez that her job was being terminated; that Rodriguez left with Cua; that she has two monitors in her office, with one showing the outside view of the front and back of the property, and the other one showing
25 nine different views from nine different cameras inside the plant; that she did not have anything pointing out to Leg Debone; that there is a video tape for the nine cameras which only records what she has on the monitors; that there is a monitor in Plant Manager Doug Hatley's office which is facing line 1 Leg Debone but it would not be able to catch anything in the middle of the Leg Debone lines; that other employees have been terminated for throwing product,
30 Respondent's Exhibits 24 (Luis Aguilar), 25 (Juleo Tomassini for "throwing chicken down a drain"), 26 (Raynaldo Morales), and 27 (Jeronimo Say); and that she did not say "you've only been here a little while and you're already causing problems" either during her interview meeting with Rodriguez or her suspension meeting with Rodriguez.

35 On cross-examination King testified that when the line is running and an employee leaves the line without permission, this causes the line to stop; that if an employee feels intimidated enough to cry, the employee has the right to stop the line anytime the employee wants to come to talk to her; that employees are routinely issued warnings for leaving the line without permission, for cussing, and for not cutting the chicken properly; that she was not
40 working in the plant when the incident covered by Respondent's Exhibit 26 occurred, she did not review the documents in this employee's personnel file before she testified herein, and there are no documents in the employees personnel file to reflect what the circumstances were surrounding the throwing product incident by Morales (transcript page 407); that on General Counsel's Exhibit 31, which is a copy of a computer record of Morales's termination, the reason
45 given for the action is "Horseplay/throwing product"; that Morales's payroll notice, Respondent's Exhibit 26, just indicates throwing product; that she was not employed at the involved facility when the incident covered by Respondent's Exhibit 27 occurred, she did not review the documents in that personnel file before she testified at the trial herein, and General Counsel's Exhibit 30 which is a copy of a computer record of Say's termination, gives as the reason for the
50 action "Horseplay/Throwing product"; that she was not employed at the involved facility when Aguilar was discharged for throwing product, she did not review his file before she testified at the trial herein, and, therefore, she did not know the circumstances under which he was

5 discharged; that she was not employed at the involved facility when Tomassini was discharged for "throwing chicken down the drain" (Respondent's Exhibit 25), and she did not review his file for any notes concerning the circumstances of him putting the product down the drain before she testified at the trial herein; that she would describe what is alleged to be Tomassini's act as
10 destruction of Company property; that Rodriguez denied throwing the product at Johnson but Rodriguez said that she threw the product at the table; that after she suspended Rodriguez she did speak to a couple of the employees who were working near Rodriguez and Johnson when the incident occurred but they denied seeing anything and there was no need to put anything in the file for it; that she did not remember which employees she spoke with regarding what they
15 witnessed; that she did not recall whether she said anything about speaking to the other employees when she gave her affidavit to the Board; that the prohibition against throwing product refers to the throwing of anything; that General Counsel's Exhibit 29, which refers to employee Marcelino Bulux who is still employed at Respondent, indicates that Bulux threw a handful of ice at another employee hitting him on his side; that General Counsel's Exhibit 28 is a
20 Disciplinary Report, a written warning, for Juan Garza dated "3-22-07" for engaging in horseplay where he picked up another employee and threw the other employee (partially on the belt where product is transported which could result in line shutdown); and that Cynthia Garza is still employed by the Respondent notwithstanding that she was involved in an incident where she hit another employee in the face with chicken neck with the head still attached, General Counsel's
25 Exhibit 26. Counsel for Respondent stipulated (a) there was nothing in Cynthia Garza's file that would reflect any discipline, and (b) with respect to General Counsel's Exhibits 34 and 35, both of which are copies of computer records and both of which give as the reason for termination "Horseplay/Throwing product," that there is nothing else other than what is in this record that would reflect the circumstances of the incidents involving Aguilar and Tomassini, respectively.

30 Subsequently King testified that she did not review the video for the one camera that faced the Leg Debone department because there was no way that it would have recorded what happened between Rodriguez and Johnson since you could barely see lines 1 and 2; that she has told employees that they can just walk away from the line if they feel intimidated without asking permission or speaking to a supervisor; that she herself did not do an independent review to look at prior personnel decisions regarding throwing product but rather she asked Campos and Rigdon what Respondent had done before with incidents of throwing product; that she personally did not look at the personnel files of other employees who were terminated for
35 throwing product; that there are two cameras in the Leg Debone department; that she did not know if the cameras in the Leg Debone department can be adjusted so that they take in more than lines 1 and 2; that she did not look at the cameras but rather just at the monitor; and that she did not review any tapes.

40 On recross King testified that she assisted counsel in formulating Respondent's response to the unfair labor practice charges; that in the response it is indicated that "Respondent admits that it maintains a number of security cameras on premise and, in fact, there are three in what is generally referred to as the Leg Debone area" (transcript page 451); that she told employees that they could walk away from the line if they are upset or intimidated; that she did not have a meeting where she told all the employees this, it was just a practice that
45 everybody knows from previous incidents when people had walked off the line to come and talk with her; that Campos, Yolandra Cardinez, and Hernandez told her that there had been other discharges for throwing product in the past; that Campos told her, for Rodriguez's job review, that if throwing product meant termination, then Rodriguez should be terminated as that was the past practice; that Campos did not have any documents with him during this conversation to
50 show that other people had been discharged for throwing product, and he did not give her any specific examples of discharges for this conduct; and that she never looked in the documents for examples until she was responding to the unfair labor practice charges.

5 Cua testified that King called him to her office and told him that he had to walk someone
 out who she suspended; that he went to King's office; that he overheard King telling Rodriguez
 that she "needed to sign her statement, whatever she been told her, but she relayed Company
 10 policy, and just sign here. ... she ... started reading to her, and then said, 'Here. Sign it right
 here.' And she signed it, and then I walked her out" (transcript page 468) ; that on Friday
 November 3 he was present for the whole meeting when Rodriguez was informed that she was
 being terminated; that during the November 3 meeting King told Rodriguez that she was
 15 terminated for throwing product and this was something that was explained during orientation;
 and that Rodriguez told King two times that she was terminating her because she protested the
 day the employees stopped working.

15 Subsequently Cua testified that 23 chicken legs a minute are processed on line 11 in
 Leg Debone; and that the individual employee working on line 11 is expected to individually
 process 23 chicken legs a minute.

Analysis

20 Paragraph 6 of the complaint alleges that on October 27 Cua and King threatened
 employees with calling immigration.¹⁴

25 General Counsel on brief, contends that it is a violation of the Act to threaten employees
 with calling the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS or Immigration) when employees
 engage in union or protected activity, *Precision Concrete*, 337 NLRB 211 (2001), enfd in
 relevant part at 334 F.3d 88, at 93 (2003) and *Westchester Iron Works Corp.*, 333 NLRB 859

30 ¹⁴ Counsel for General Counsel's motion to correct the complaint to correctly spell the
 surname of the Human Resource Supervisor identified therein is hereby granted. The name
 Miguel Cua will be substituted for Miguel Puac. Counsel for General Counsel also makes
 another motion for the first time in her brief, namely to amend the complaint to allege that
 Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act by conditioning continued employment with
 Respondent on a waiver of the right to engage in future concerted activity when King on
 35 October 27 told employees that when they return to work on October 30 the glove policy put into
 effect on October 27 would still be implemented, and that if they did not want to work under that
 policy "don't even bother coming." According to her own testimony, what King said was as
 follows:

40 Look, look guys, this is what you wanted, you got what you wanted. When you come
 back on Monday, you're going to get your three pairs of better yellow gloves you wanted.
 If you want to work, come to work. But if you don't want to work, don't even bother
 coming. Let's not go through this again. [Transcript page 337]

45 It does not appear that with this language Respondent, by King, was conditioning continued
 employment on a waiver of the right to engage in future protected concerted activity. What King
 was saying was that the policy was not going to change, if they wanted to work with the new
 policy that was fine, but if they did not want to work on Monday they should not bother coming to
 work. It does not appear that King was either explicitly or implicitly telling the employees that to
 be able to go to work on Monday they had to waive their right to engage in future protected
 concerted activity. Additionally, whether this language in the circumstances existing here is a
 violation of the Act is first being brought up on brief after the close of the trial. Does Counsel for
 50 General Counsel believe that Respondent has had sufficient notice that the lawfulness of this
 language would be at issue? Counsel for General Counsel's Motion to further amend the
 complaint is denied.

(2002); that it is more than probable that Cua made this violative threat; that King's denial that she threatened to call Immigration is not credible in that throughout the trial King's testimony was inconsistent and often contradicted Respondent's other witnesses; that King had a propensity to form testimony to suit Respondent's case; and that Rodriguez was a credible and forthright witness.

Respondent on brief argues that both Cua and King denied threatening to call Immigration on October 27 and the evidence offered by General Counsel simply is not credible; that the only witness offered in support of this allegation is Rodriguez, who is a most unimpressive witness; that no other employee supported Rodriguez's testimony; that although there were at least 50 other employees in the vicinity when King was speaking to employees when they came back to get their paychecks, including Rodriguez's friends Edgar and Martha, no other employee supported Rodriguez's dramatic testimony that King told the employees "not to force her to call the police or [I]mmigration because I will send you back to your country" (transcript page 161); that Rodriguez's testimony about these threats has the ring of being contrived in that in both instances she alleges that Cua said "don't make us call - have to call Immigration" (transcript page 157) and King allegedly said "not to force her to call the police or Immigration" (transcript page 161); that the similarity of these alleged statements indicates fabrication; that Rodriguez in general was contradicted and incredible in numerous respects; that Rodriguez admittedly lied when she was asked for her Company I.D. on October 31; that while Rodriguez testified that she knew no English at all (Respondent cites transcript page 200 where Rodriguez testified "I don't even know how to speak English." But at transcript pages 149 and 150, at the outset of her testimony, Rodriguez was asked if she spoke English and she replied "No, a little bit."), Ronda and Raymundo testified that Rodriguez uttered at least two words in English during her confrontation with Johnson; that while Rodriguez testified that she hid behind Ronda during her confrontation with Johnson, Ronda and Raymundo testified that this was not the case; and that the employees' work stoppage had become unprotected at the time the threats were allegedly were made and consequently, even if, assuming arguendo, they were made, they did not violate the Act.

I do not believe that Counsel for General Counsel has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that Cua and King threatened to call Immigration on October 27. Counsel for General Counsel produced only one witness to support these allegations. That witness, Rodriguez, is one of the two alleged discriminatees in this proceeding. She has a monetary interest in the outcome of this proceeding. Her testimony is not corroborated albeit there were many, many people present when the statements were allegedly made. Additionally, it is not clear why King, on October 27 when she was telling the employees that the glove policy was going to be enforced on Monday October 30 and the employees had to make up their minds whether they wanted to work on Monday, would tell the employees to leave and not to force her to call Immigration. There is no allegation that the employees were engaged in a sit down strike when they came back to the facility in the afternoon to pick up their paycheck. Indeed it appears that it was just the opposite. At least one employee, according to Rodriguez's own testimony, told King that they had come to pick up their paycheck and they did not want to hear what King had to say. In other words, it has not been shown that the employees wanted to do anything other than get their paychecks and get out of Respondent's facility. As pointed out by Respondent, Rodriguez admittedly lied about her Company I.D. I believe that Rodriguez also lied under oath about what she said in English to Johnson during their confrontation on October 31. I believe that the two words that Ronda and Raymundo heard Rodriguez say to Johnson during this confrontation were "Fuck you." (See Respondent's Exhibit 20 which was not received for the truth of the matter asserted.) A threat to call Immigration is a very serious charge. Counsel for General Counsel has not produced sufficient evidence to warrant a finding that this threat was made by either Cua or King on October 27.

Paragraph 7 of the complaint alleges that Respondent terminated Zamora on October 30 and Rodriguez on October 31 because they engaged in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection and in order to discourage employees from engaging in such concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

With respect to Dimas (a.k.a.Zamora), General Counsel on brief contends that the evidence establishes a prima facie violation under *Wright Line*, 251 NLRB 1083 (1980), enfd. 662 F.2d 899 (1st Cir. 1981), cert denied 455 U.S. 989 (1982) and *NLRB v. Transportation Management Corp.*, 462 U.S. 393, 395 (1983) (approving *Wright Line* analysis) in that (a) Dimas was engaged in protected concerted activity when she participated in the walk out and when she acted as spokesperson and talked to newspaper reporters, (b) there is no question that Respondent knew Dimas's role since King testified that Wilson emailed her the newspaper article in which Zamora's (Dimas) name appears, and (c) the timing of the discharge one working day after Dimas's protected activity and the pretextual reasons given for the discharge demonstrate Respondent's motivation to rid itself of Dimas and send a clear message to its remaining employees; that the reason given by Respondent for the discharge is pretextual because Respondent treated Dimas as a probationary employee in October 2006 even though Dimas had worked for Respondent since 1999, except for 4 months; that Dimas's immigration status is not relevant to whether Respondent unlawfully discharged her because the Act protects statutory employees who are undocumented aliens, *Sure Tan, Inc. v. NLRB*, 467 U.S. 883 (1984) and *Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB*, 535 U.S. 137 (2002); that an Administrative Law Judge cannot base his decision to discredit an employee solely on the employee's use of a false social security number to obtain employment, *In re Double D Construction Group*, 339 NLRB 303 (2003)¹⁵; to the extent that the discharge of Dimas is based

¹⁵ That case is distinguishable. There the employee did subsequently acquire his own valid social security number, and not long after his termination, he provided information to the Respondent in order to correct his own record. There, the majority of the Board concluded that the Judge's discrediting of the employee was based solely on his use of a false social security number to obtain employment; and that this amounted to a disqualification of the employee for his conduct. Here Dimas did not acquire her own valid social number when she received the SSA letter. Rather she went out and purchased a whole new identity, namely a new false name, a new false social security number (card), a new false permanent resident card, and a new false birthday. Respondent's Exhibit 6. And then she gave her new documentation to the Respondent to keep her job. As pointed out in *Hoffman Plastics*, this is a crime. While she worked for Respondent under her new identity, she never attempted to correct the record. When she testified at the trial herein her remorse for using the identity of another person consisted of her testifying "I didn't want to be without employment, and now I regret doing it because it didn't do me any good." (transcript page 148) Forgetting the legal technicalities for the moment, common sense would dictate that if a person is willing to commit a crime to get a job, then commit a serious crime to keep the job, consideration must be given to the fact that the person would commit a crime (intentionally, falsely testifying under oath about material facts) to get back at those who, from her viewpoint, took that job away from her. As noted above, Herrera testified that when he escorted Dimas out of the facility she told him that he "cheated her out of her job." (transcript page 500). Dimas did not testify on rebuttal to deny making this statement. By law, she did not have the legal right to hold that job in the first place. Here, no matter what the outcome, under *Sure Tan, Inc.*, supra, and *Hoffman Plastic*, supra, there will be no reinstatement or back pay for Dimas. To resolve whether she was unlawfully terminated I do not have to, and I do not, rely on her credibility. This determination was made at the time of her

Continued

on credibility, the testimony of Dimas should be credited over that of Respondent who cannot be found to be without fault in the acceptance of a new name, social security number, and birth date from an employee whom they had employed since 1999; that King cavalierly testified that she had no right to question Dimas about her new documentation notwithstanding that she knew that Dimas had worked for Respondent since 1999; that regardless of whether Dimas was a new probationary employee or a senior employee employed at Respondent since 1999, Respondent failed to treat Dimas in the same manner as other injured employees and instead seized upon a reason to discharge her; that while King told Dimas that she could not receive a leave of absence, Dimas was not asking for a leave of absence; that Dimas was requesting light duty for 5 days; that Respondent did not even attempt for Dimas to go to a company doctor to determine if her pain, a type of pain commonly associated with the repetitive nature of the work, was work related; that Respondent's medical records and OSHA records establish that Respondent has accommodated both work and non-work related injuries for employees in their probationary period (i.e. probationary employee Alisha Rutherford was given light duty after she sustained a non-work related injury, General Counsel's Exhibits 4 and 18) and beyond their probationary period (In addition to Rutherford, Counsel for General Counsel gave 14 examples of Respondent's approach in her brief.); and that, even though Dimas did not ask for a leave of absence, those cases cited by Respondent where it did not grant probationary employees a leave of absence are distinguishable.

With respect to Dimas (a.k.a. Zamora) and Rodriguez, Respondent on brief argues that the complaint by implication concedes that the October 27 protest was unprotected in that it is not alleged that calling in the police was a violation of the Act; that General Counsel effectively concedes the unprotected "trespassory" (Respondent's brief page 21) nature of the job action; that an employer can terminate leaders of an unprotected job action without violating the Act; that while discussing employee grievances with the press may in certain circumstances constitute protected activity, this particular newspaper article cannot be divorced from the unprotected work stoppage itself; that because the activities of Dimas and Rodriguez were not legally protected the unlawful discharge allegations fail as a matter of law; that General Counsel failed to establish animus toward either the work stoppage or the newspaper article; that Dimas and Rodriguez were terminated solely for independent intervening events that occurred early the following week; that General Counsel has failed to make a prima facie showing sufficient to support an inference that the protected conduct was a motivating factor in the employer's decision to terminate these two employees; that there must be some evidence of employer

testimony and took into consideration her demeanor (lack of remorse for committing a crime and she conveyed the distinct impression while testifying at the trial herein the job was what mattered the most), the weight of the respective evidence can be determined without including a consideration of Dimas's lack of credibility and it does not affect her credibility or the lack thereof, established or admitted facts are what they are in that they do not rehabilitate this witness, and one would have to, in determining inherent probabilities and reasonable inferences drawn from the record as a whole, take into consideration that witness Dimas committed a serious crime to get her job (false social security number), she admittedly committed a very serious crime to keep her job (As pointed out in *Hoffman Plastic*, supra, it is a crime for an unauthorized alien to subvert the employer verification system by tendering fraudulent documents.), and her only remorse in the end is that she regretted doing it because "it didn't do me any good." (transcript page 148) It is one thing to use a nonvalid social security number. It is quite something else to buy another person's identity. To treat such conduct lightly could be misconstrued as encouraging a practice which has become widespread, namely identity theft, which practice can have a devastating effect on its victims, even if limited to just trying to straighten out social security records and the ramifications which flow there from.

animus directed at the employee's protected activity; that an employer may act on the reasonable belief that an employee committed the offense charged; that the issue is whether the employer's belief as to the facts was honestly held and whether these facts (as believed) were such that the employer likely would have been motivated to act as it did; that while the timing of the two terminations brings into question an inference of animus, the timing actually favors Respondent, close timing between protected activity and termination may go a long way toward establishing animus when there is no apparent intervening cause for the termination, but when there is such an intervening cause and the termination follows shortly thereafter, the timing factor favors the employer, *Woodruff & Sons, Inc.*, 265 NLRB 345, 347 (1982); that this is not one of those rare cases in which the Board can infer animus 'from evidence of blatantly disparate treatment' (Respondent's brief page 27) *New Otani Hotel & Garden*, 325 NLRB 928 (1998); that although Counsel for General Counsel attempted to show disparate treatment she fell short of establishing 'blatant disparity' (Id.); that while Respondent sometimes accommodated alleged workers' compensation injuries that later turned out to be non-work related, Respondent did so only while the cause of the condition was being investigated and only when the safety department was supervising and directing the employee's medical care; that "there is no evidence that Respondent ever accommodated an employee based on a note that the employee obtained from her own personal physician" (Id. at 28, emphasis added); that Respondent treated Dimas (a.k.a. Zamora) as a probationary employee since September 2006, long before the work stoppage; that there is no showing of blatant disparity regarding Dimas; that with respect to Rodriguez, there is zero tolerance for throwing product, two co-workers and a supervisor told King that they observed Rodriguez throwing product, whether she actually did is immaterial, and Respondent clearly believed in good faith that she had thrown product; that whether Johnson threw product is not clear; that Raymundo did not see Johnson throw product; that Johnson denied throwing product (This would be hearsay since Johnson did not testify at the trial herein.); that while Ronda testified that he saw Johnson throw product and he told King about this, the statement he signed does not indicate that Johnson threw product and he testified that the statement was accurate and it contained everything he told King; that Johnson was terminated a few months after her confrontation with Rodriguez for attendance problems and there was no reason for King not to terminate her over her October 31 confrontation with Rodriguez, if Johnson did in fact throw product; that there is insufficient record evidence upon which to base a finding of unlawful motivation; that Counsel for General Counsel has not shown animus; that assuming arguendo that General Counsel established a prima facie case, Respondent carried its *Wright Line*, supra, burden in that Respondent's standard practice regarding probationary employees who are medically restricted for personal reasons is to terminate their employment, subject to reapplying and being rehired after 30 days; that Dimas was treated consistently with this practice; that Rodriguez was terminated consistently with Respondent's policy and practice of terminating employees who throw product; and that assuming arguendo that Dimas was unlawfully terminated, she is not eligible for the standard reinstatement and back pay remedy since the decisions in *Sure Tan, Inc.*, supra, and *Hoffman Plastic, supra*, hold that the Board is without power to award reinstatement or back pay to an alien.

Regarding the arguments made by Respondent with respect to Dimas (a.k.a. Zamora), the fact that it did not specifically take any action against Dimas for her role in what Respondent describes as an unprotected job action demonstrates that Respondent was not relying on this at the time of her termination. The same would apply with respect to Rodriguez. Both Dimas and Respondent played the system. Neither one came into this proceeding with clean hands. Dimas committed crimes to get and keep her job with Respondent. Respondent accommodated Dimas notwithstanding that any reasonable person would have asked what was going on when a person changes their name, social security number, and their birth date, making them more than 2 years younger than previously represented. If the situation at hand were approached in

terms of the equities involved, one might ask why Respondent did not treat Dimas as a senior employee on October 30. In my opinion, Respondent knew exactly what was going on with respect to her employment status. But Dimas herself created the situation when she gave Respondent the fraudulent documentation. The fiction of Dimas being a probationary employ

5 was put in place in September 2006, long before the October 27 work stoppage. And it was put into place effectively at the behest of Dimas as a means of her keeping her job. So from a labor law standpoint, the fact that Dimas on October 30 was a probationary employee could not have been unlawfully motivated. Respondent took advantage of the situation. But Dimas put in play the means by which Respondent was able to take advantage of the situation, and this was done

10 long before the work stoppage. Under *Wright Line*, supra, Dimas engaged in protected concerted activity. Even if one takes the position that the work stoppage lost the protection of the Act because the employees refused to leave the Company's premises resulting in the police being summoned, there is still the newspaper article in which Dimas (a.k.a. Zamora) aired a grievance of Respondent's employees. It has not been shown that anything occurred with

15 respect to the newspaper interview which would cause Dimas to lose the protection of the Act. The interview occurred away from Respondent's property and while its focal point might have been the reasons for the work stoppage, the interview can and should be treated separately from the walkout. Therefore, Dimas engaged in protected activity and the Respondent knew about it before she was terminated. But has Counsel for General Counsel shown animus on the

20 part of Respondent? Has Counsel for General Counsel shown that the termination was unlawfully motivated? Counsel for General Counsel cites four factors, namely (a) the timing of the discharge just one workday after the work stoppage, (b) the pretextual reasons given by Respondent because Respondent treated Dimas as a probationary employee, (c) the assertion that Dimas was treated disparately, and (d) Dimas did not ask for a leave of absence and this

25 was King's reason for terminating Dimas. Dimas herself chose the timing in that she was the one who presented Respondent on October 30 with a situation it had to resolve. No inference of animus or unlawful motivation can, therefore, be drawn from the timing alone. With respect to Counsel for General Counsel's contention that the reason given by Respondent for Dimas's termination is pretextual because she should not have been treated as a probationary employee

30 on October 30, one has to accept the fact that Dimas had been treated as a probationary employee since September 2006 or, in other words, for some time before October 30. That was the status occasioned by Dimas's own use of fraudulent documentation when she changed her name, social security number, resident alien card, and birth date. She participated in this fiction long before the work stoppage. When this fiction began it had nothing to do with animus or

35 unlawful motivation on the part of Respondent toward Dimas's protected activity. Consequently no weight can be given to the contention that treating Dimas as a probationary employee on October 30 was pretextual. As Respondent argues on brief, (1) while Respondent sometimes accommodated alleged workers' compensation injuries that later turned out to be non-work related, Respondent did so only while the cause of the condition was being investigated and

40 only when the safety department was supervising and directing the employee's medical care, and (2) there is no evidence that Respondent ever accommodated an employee based on a note that the employee obtained from her own personal physician. It has not been shown by the record herein that these arguments of the Respondent are false. Finally, Counsel for General Counsel finds fault in the fact that albeit Dimas did not verbally ask for a leave of absence on

45 October 30, King approached her request in that manner. As noted above, Dimas's doctor's note (Actually the note was from a physician's assistant at Table Rock Family Medicine clinic.) reads, "Light work or no work ... [see left] arm for one week." For King to interpret the note as asking that Dimas be given a week off from work does not appear to be unreasonable. The record considered as a whole does not warrant any inference of animus or unlawful motivation

50 on the part of Respondent. The Respondent did not violate the Act in terminating Dimas (a.k.a. Zamora).

5 With respect to Rodriguez, General Counsel on brief contends that but for Rodriguez's participation in the work stoppage Respondent would not have discharged Rodriguez; that when Rodriguez participated in the work stoppage and spoke to newspaper reporters on behalf of the participating employees who were protesting Respondent's change in the glove policy, she was engaged in concerted activity that is protected by the Act; that King admits that she saw the newspaper article in which Rodriguez was quoted as the spokesperson of the employees who engaged in the work stoppage; that the first requirements of *Wright Line*, supra, are met, namely that the employee engaged in activity protected by the Act and the Respondent had knowledge of that participation; that Respondent's unlawful motive in discharging Rodriguez because of her protected activities is established by the suspicious timing of the discharge, the one-sided investigation of the events leading to the discharge, and the disparity between Respondent's treatment of Rodriguez and of other employees involved in similar incidents; that Raymundo testified that he could give a warning for throwing product but he was not involved in the decision to discharge Rodriguez; that the disparity in the treatment of Johnson and Rodriguez is a result of Rodriguez's involvement in the work stoppage and her designation as a spokesperson for the other employees; that while King testified that precedence is the most important factor considered by Respondent, prior to Rodriguez's discharge she did not conduct an independent review to look at prior personnel decisions regarding throwing product nor did she personally examine the personnel files of other employees terminated for throwing product; that she relied on the representation of top management that Respondent had a precedence of discharging employees who throw product; that King asserts that Campos stated that if throwing product meant termination then Rodriguez should be discharged but he did not provide King with any documents to show King that other employees had been terminated for similar conduct; that Respondent did not present one instance of discharge of an employee who returned poorly cut chicken to an employee on the line either by tossing it on the table in front of the employee or by any other method; that the examples cited by Respondent involve situations where the employee who was discharged was engaged in horseplay and/or the sponsoring witness was unable to testify about the circumstances surrounding the discharge; that Rodriguez was not engaged in horseplay; that Counsel for General Counsel presented evidence that Respondent failed to discharge or even suspend employees whom it accused of throwing items in the plant, namely (a) Gerra, who is presently employed at Respondent, hitting another employee in the face with a chicken neck with the head still attached, and (b) Buluz, who is presently employed at Respondent, receiving a verbal warning for throwing ice and hitting another employee with it; and that the timing of the discharge of Rodriguez, the sham investigation into the chicken throwing incident, and the disparity of Respondent's treatment of Rodriguez establish that Respondent discharged Rodriguez because of her protected concerted activity or participating in a work stoppage and of speaking to the press on behalf of employees.

40 Respondent's arguments regarding Rodriguez are set forth above.

45 As pointed out by Counsel for General Counsel on brief, that the first requirements of *Wright Line*, supra, are met, namely that Rodriguez engaged in activity protected by the Act and the Respondent had knowledge of that participation. As noted above, Counsel for General Counsel goes on to contend that Respondent's unlawful motive in discharging Rodriguez because of her protected activities is established by (1) the suspicious timing of the discharge, (2) the one-sided investigation of the events leading to the discharge, and (3) the disparity between Respondent's treatment of Rodriguez and of other employees involved in similar incidents. Again, the employee Rodriguez dictated the timing in that she admittedly got into a confrontation with Johnson on October 31. Rodriguez herself presented the Respondent with a situation that it had to resolve. The timing is not suspicious, and it should not reasonably lead to the conclusion that animus or unlawful motivation should be inferred based on this. The investigation of the incident was not one-sided. King spoke with and had written statements

5 from Johnson, Rodriguez, Raymundo, and Ronda. If Ronda's testimony had not been equivocal about whether he advised King that he saw Johnson also throw product, this conclusion might be different. But in view of his testimony that his written statement was accurate and complete, and the written statement does not mention Johnson throwing chicken, I do not believe that it
10 can be concluded that Respondent's investigation of the incident was one-sided. But as pointed out by General Counsel on brief, while King testified that precedence is the most important factor considered by Respondent, prior to Rodriguez's discharge she did not conduct an independent review to look at prior personnel decisions regarding throwing product nor did she personally examine the personnel files of other employees terminated for throwing product.
15 Instead King relied on the representation of top management that Respondent had a precedence of discharging employees who throw product. King asserts that Campos stated that if throwing product meant termination, then Rodriguez should be discharged but he did not provide King with any documents to show King that other employees had been terminated for similar conduct. As General Counsel points out on brief, Respondent did not present one
20 instance of discharge of an employee who returned poorly cut chicken to an employee on the line either by tossing it on the table in front of the employee or by any other method. The examples cited by Respondent involved situations where the employee who was discharged was engaged in horseplay and/or Respondent's sponsoring witness was unable to testify about the circumstances surrounding the discharge. I agree with General Counsel that Rodriguez was not engaged in horseplay. Additionally, Counsel for General Counsel presented evidence that Respondent failed to discharge or even suspend employees whom it accused of throwing items in the plant, namely Gerra and Buluz. And finally Raymundo testified that he has given written warnings to employees for throwing items. Since Counsel for General Counsel has demonstrated that there was no real investigation of the precedent involving throwing product and there is a blatant disparity between Respondent's treatment of Rodriguez and the treatment of other of its employees involved in throwing product or other items, she has shown that an inference should be drawn that animus regarding protected activity and unlawful motivation on the part of Respondent caused Rodriguez's termination. I believe that this finding is warranted notwithstanding the fact that there is no other finding of an independent violation of the Act.

30 Respondent argues that even if Counsel for General Counsel meets her burden under *Wright Line* and has made a prima facie showing sufficient to support an inference that the protected conduct was a motivating factor in the termination of Rodriguez, the Respondent has shown that it had a legitimate business reason for Rodriguez's termination. It is pointed out by
35 the Respondent that if an employer establishes legitimate grounds for adverse action and there is no evidence of similarly situated employees being treated more favorably, the employer has carried its *Wright Line* burden. Respondent argues that Rodriguez was terminated consistently with policy and practice. I do not agree with Respondent's argument. Counsel for General Counsel demonstrated that this is not the case in that she showed similarly situated employees being treated more favorably. Counsel for General Counsel has shown blatant disparate treatment.

45 Can one reach the conclusion that an adverse inference should be drawn with respect to Rodriguez and not with respect to Dimas even though both employees were engaged in the same concerted activity? I believe that such an approach is appropriate. The situations of Dimas and Rodriguez can be viewed differently based in whether Counsel for General Counsel met her burden of proof under *Wright Line* regarding them individually. Respondent's treatment of Rodriguez vis-a vis other of Respondent's employees warranted an inference of animus and unlawful motivation. In my opinion, Counsel for General Counsel did not make that showing regarding Dimas. And I do not believe that the fact that Counsel for General Counsel succeeded in Rodriguez's situation carries over to Dimas.
50

Conclusions of Law

On these findings of fact and conclusions of law and on the entire record, I issue the following recommended¹⁶

5

By terminating Rodriguez on October 31 (actually on November 3) because she engaged in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection and in order to discourage employees from engaging in such concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, Case Farms of North Carolina, Inc. has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

10

Remedy

15

Having found that the Respondent has engaged in certain unfair labor practices, I find that it must be ordered to cease and desist and to take certain affirmative action designed to effectuate the policies of the Act.

20

The Respondent having discriminatorily discharged an employee, it must offer her reinstatement and make her whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits, computed on a quarterly basis from date of discharge to date of proper offer of reinstatement, less any net interim earnings, as prescribed in *F. W. Woolworth Co.*, 90 NLRB 289 (1950), plus interest as computed in *New Horizons for the Retarded*, 283 NLRB 1173 (1987).¹⁷

25

On these findings of fact and conclusions of law and on the entire record, I issue the following recommended¹⁸

ORDER

30

The Respondent, Case Farms of North Carolina, Inc. of Morganton, North Carolina, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

35

¹⁶ If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

40

¹⁷ On brief Counsel for General Counsel requests that the interest be compounded. She points out that this is not currently the Board practice. Unless and until the Board changes its practice, the current Board practice will be applied. Counsel for General Counsel also requests that (a) the notice be posted in Spanish and English, and (b) Respondent be required to hold group meetings with employees in which an official of the Board can read the Notice to Employees in Spanish and English. The request to require that the notice be posted in Spanish and English is reasonable under the circumstances of this case, and such request will be granted. No need has been shown herein for the granting of the request to hold group meetings with employees in which an official of the Board can read the Notice to employees in Spanish and English, and such request is denied.

45

50

¹⁸ If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

(1) Cease and desist from

(a) Terminating an employee because she engaged in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection and in order to discourage employees from engaging in such concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) Within 14 days from the date of the Board's Order, offer Luz Rodriguez full reinstatement to her former job or, if that job no longer exists, to a substantially equivalent position, without prejudice to her seniority or any other rights or privileges previously enjoyed.

(b) Make Luz Rodriguez whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits suffered as a result of the discrimination against her in the manner set forth in the remedy section of the decision.

(c) Within 14 days from the date of the Board's Order, remove from its files any reference to the unlawful discharge, and within 3 days thereafter notify the employee in writing that this has been done and that the discharge will not be used against her in any way.

(d) Preserve and, within 14 days of a request, or such additional time as the Regional Director may allow for good cause shown, provide at a reasonable place designated by the Board or its agents, all payroll records, social security payment records, timecards, personnel records and reports, and all other records, including an electronic copy of such records if stored in electronic form, necessary to analyze the amount of backpay due under the terms of this Order.

(e) Within 14 days after service by the Region, post in Spanish and English at its facility in Morganton, North Carolina, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."¹⁹ Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 11, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event that, during the pendency of these proceedings, the Respondent has gone out of business or closed the facility involved in these proceedings, the Respondent shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice in Spanish and English to all current employees and former employees employed by the Respondent at any time since October 31, 2006.

(f) Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondent has taken to comply.

¹⁹ If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the complaint is dismissed insofar as it alleges violations of the Act not specifically found.

5 Dated, Washington, D.C., September 28, 2007.

John H. West
Administrative Law Judge

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

5

Posted by Order of the
National Labor Relations Board
An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this Notice.

10

FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

15

- Form, join, or assist a union
- Choose representatives to bargain with us on your behalf
- Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection
- Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities

20

WE WILL NOT terminate you because you engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection and in order to discourage you from engaging in such concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

25

WE WILL within 14 days from the date of the Board's Order, offer Luz Rodriguez full reinstatement to her former job or, if that job no longer exists, to a substantially equivalent position, without prejudice to her seniority or any other rights or privileges previously enjoyed.

WE WILL make Luz Rodriguez whole for any loss of earnings and other benefits resulting from her discharge, less any net interim earnings, plus interest.

30

WE WILL, within 14 days from the date of this Order, remove from our files any reference to the unlawful discharge of Luz Rodriguez, and WE WILL, within 3 days thereafter, notify her in writing that this has been done and that the discharge will not be used against her in any way.

35

Case Farms of North Carolina, Inc.

Dated _____ By _____
(Representative) (Title)

40

The National Labor Relations Board is an independent Federal agency created in 1935 to enforce the National Labor Relations Act. It conducts secret-ballot elections to determine whether employees want union representation and it investigates and remedies unfair labor practices by employers and unions. To find out more about your rights under the Act and how to file a charge or election petition, you may speak confidentially to any agent with the Board's Regional Office set forth below. You may also obtain information from the Board's website: www.nlr.gov.

45

4035 University Parkway, Republic Square, Suite 200 Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27106-3323
Hours: 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. 336-631-5201.

50

THIS IS AN OFFICIAL NOTICE AND MUST NOT BE DEFACED BY ANYONE
THIS NOTICE MUST REMAIN POSTED FOR 60 CONSECUTIVE DAYS FROM THE DATE OF POSTING AND MUST NOT BE ALTERED, DEFACED, OR COVERED BY ANY OTHER MATERIAL.
ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NOTICE OR COMPLIANCE WITH ITS PROVISIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO THE ABOVE REGIONAL OFFICE'S
COMPLIANCE OFFICER, (336) 631-5230