UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 2

AJD, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases: 02-CA-093895 02-CA-097827**
KARAVITES 11102 OF 42ND STREET, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases: 02-CA-093893 02-CA-098662**
18884 FOOD CORP., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases: 02-CA-094224 02-CA-098676**
14 EAST 47TH STREET, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases: 02-CA-094679 02-CA-098604**
JOHN C FOOD CORP., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases: 02-CA-093927 02-CA-098659**
840 ATLANTIC AVENUE, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case: 02-CA-097305**
1531 FULTON STREET, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases: 02-CA-103771 02-CA-112282**
McCONNER STREET HOLDING, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case: 02-CA-098809**
McCONNER STREET HOLDING, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case: 02-CA-103384**
MIC-EASTCHESTER, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case: 02-CA-103726**
BRUCE C. LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, A McDONALD'S	**Case: 02-CA-106094**

FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS

and

FAST FOOD WORKERS COMMITTEE AND SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, CTW, CLC

JO-DAN MADALISSE LTD, LLC d/b/a MCDONALD'S, A FRANCHISEE OF MCDONALD'S USA, LLC and MCDONALD'S USA, LLC Joint Employers	**Cases**	**04-CA-125567** **04-CA-129783** **04-CA-133621**

and

PENNSYLVANIA WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, A PROJECT OF THE FAST FOOD WORKERS COMMITTEE

and

KARAVITES RESTAURANTS 11102, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S, USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-106490**
KARAVITES RESTAURANTS 26, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S, USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-106491**
RMC LOOP ENTERPRISES, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-106493**
WRIGHT MANAGEMENT, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S, USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**13-CA-107668** **13-CA-113837**
V. OVIEDO, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**13-CA-115647** **13-CA-119015** **13-CA-123916** **13-CA-124813** **13-CA-131440**
McDONALD'S RESTAURANTS OF ILLINOIS, INC.	**Cases**	**13-CA-117083** **13-CA-118691** **13-CA-121759**

LOFTON & LOFTON MANAGEMENT V, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-118690**
K. MARK ENTERPRISES, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**13-CA-123699** **13-CA-129771**
NORNAT, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-124213**
KARAVITES RESTAURANT 5895, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S, USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-124812**
TAYLOR & MALONE MANAGEMENT, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S, USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-129709**
RMC ENTERPRISES, LLC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-131141**
KARAVITES RESTAURANT 6676, LLC, McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-131143**
TOPAZ MANAGEMENT, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Case**	**13-CA-131145**
and		
WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF CHICAGO		
and		
MAZT, INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, AS JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**20-CA-132103** **20-CA-135947** **20-CA-135979** **20-CA-137264**
and		
WESTERN WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF CHICAGO		
FAITH CORPORATION OF INDIANAPOLIS, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC, JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**25-CA-114819** **25-CA-114915** **25-CA-130734**

and **25-CA-130746**

WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF CHICAGO

and

D. BAILEY MANAGEMENT COMPANY, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC AS JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**31-CA-127447** **31-CA-130085** **31-CA-130090** **31-CA-132489** **31-CA-135529** **31-CA-135590**
2MANGAS INC., A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC AS JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**31-CA-129982** **31-CA-134237**
SANDERS-CLARK & CO., INC, A McDONALD'S FRANCHISEE, AND McDONALD'S USA, LLC AS JOINT EMPLOYERS	**Cases**	**31-CA-128483** **31-CA-129027** **31-CA-133117**

and

LOS ANGELES ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

KARAVITES RESTAURANTS 11102, LLC'S MOTION TO SEVER

Karavites Restaurants 11102, LLC (hereinafter "Karavites"), files this Motion to Sever pursuant to the National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter "Board") Rules and Regulations, Section 102.33(d), and respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") order severance of these proceedings such that the cases against Karavites are consolidated with each other but are severed from those cases involving separate independent Franchisees, who are not even alleged to have any joint employment relationship with Karavites.

BACKGROUND

Karavites is a Franchisee that independently operated a franchise of McDonald's USA, LLC ("McDonald's") located at 201 North Clark Street in Chicago, Illinois ("the Restaurant"). The Restaurant was located in a food court in downtown Chicago, next to the "Clark/Lake" train

stop. Karavites is the only employer of the employees that worked at the Restaurant. Karavites made all employment decisions concerning the Restaurant, including, but not limited to, decisions regarding employee hiring and termination, employee discipline, and employee schedules and hours of work.

The Workers Organizing Committee of Chicago ("Charging Party") has filed unfair labor practice charges alleging that Karavites violated Sections 8(a)(1) and (3) of the National Labor Relations Act (also the "Act"). Specifically, Charging Party alleges that Karavites violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act when it prohibited employees from signing anything relating to unionization, solicited and promised resolutions to employee grievances, surveilled employees engaged in a demonstration, and implemented a work rule relating to employee breaks in response to protected conduct. Charging Party further alleges that Karavites violated Section 8(a)(3) of the Act when it allegedly reduced the working hours, and modified the work duties, for two employees in response to their engaging in protected conduct. These purported violations of the Act relate to the alleged conduct of Franchisee Operator Nick Karavites ("Operator Karavites"), and a number of current and former employees of the Restaurant, including Sonya Acuna, Victor Guzman, and Sosimo Mendez. Karavites categorically denies that these charges have any merit and looks forward to the opportunity to defend itself against these allegations.

Notwithstanding the relatively straightforward factual and legal premise of the case against this Franchisee, Karavites' ability to present its case and resolve these claims has been severely prejudiced by the General Counsel's decision to consolidate 61 unfair labor practice charges, across 5 states, involving 21 different independent operators, operating 30 different restaurants.[1]

[1] On January 5, 2015, the General Counsel transferred cases from Regions 4, 13, 20, 25, and 31 to the Regional Director for Region 2. On January 6, 2015, the Regional Director consolidated the transferred cases for hearing with the consolidated cases in Region 2. It is noteworthy that the General Counsel did not, initially, serve Karavites with

Rather than simply being able to evaluate the merits of the claims for alleged violations of Sections 8(a)(1) and 8(a)(3) of the Act, and develop a strategy for resolution, Karavites has been dragged into this unmanageable morass involving parties, practices, and factual allegations that are wholly unrelated to the claims against Karavites, or even as to the alleged joint employment relationship between Karavites and McDonald's. The only thing that these cases have in common is the "McDonald's" brand name which, in and of itself, does not serve as a basis for consolidation. The General Counsel's decision to consolidate these cases is an extraordinary abuse of discretion given the particularized nature of each case and the high propensity for prejudice to each party's ability to effectively present evidence free of conflation with separate cases and legal issues. The ALJ should sever the consolidated charges such that all charges against Karavites are consolidated with each other but not consolidated with charges involving separate and distinct Franchisees. There simply is no factual connection between the complaints themselves to justify consolidation and as a result, this unprecedented action undermines the purpose of the Act.

I. The Consolidation Violates Board Rule 101.10 On The Location Of Hearings

The General Counsel's consolidation violates Board Rule 101.10, which provides that "[e]xcept in extraordinary situations the hearing is …usually conducted in the Region where the charge originated." The General Counsel offers no basis for violating this rule. There are no extraordinary circumstances present to justify hearing cases from six different Regions at various locations around the country.

The General Counsel has proposed hearing Regions 2 and 4 in New York, Regions 13 and 25 in Chicago, and Regions 20 and 31 in Los Angeles. Despite this phased process, the record will remain open for the duration of the entire trial, thus forcing all parties to participate in this

copies of these documents, as it is representative of the General Counsel's failure to see how its actions affect independent Franchisees across the country.

ongoing hearing process. This is an incredible expense for the parties involved and is not justified by any prevailing extraordinary situation or interest. Indeed, each Franchisee is facing a series of fairly simple but factually specific claims which will require individual adjudication. The joint employer issue will require an examination of McDonald's relationship with each Franchisee specific to the claims against it. The consolidation will not provide greater efficiency in hearing these matters, but on the contrary, will dramatically increase the time and expense of resolution of each of these claims. As such, commensurate with Board Rule 101.10, the ALJ should order the severance of this case as to each independent Franchisee and the cases should be heard in their respective Regions.

II. Consolidation Of These Factually Distinct Cases Is An Abuse Of Discretion By The General Counsel

Board Rule § 102.33(a) gives the General Counsel discretion to consolidate cases where "necessary in order to effectuate the purpose of the Act or to avoid unnecessary costs or delay." This discretion, however, is not unbounded and is subject to review for an abuse of discretion. *See Service Employees Union, Local 87 (Cresleigh Management, Inc.)*, 324 NLRB 774, 774 (1997). Further, Board Rule § 102.35(a)(8) gives the ALJ the authority to "upon motion order proceedings consolidated or severed." The ALJ should exercise her authority to sever the consolidated cases such that all cases against each independent Franchisee are consolidated with each other, but are severed from those cases involving separate Franchisees.

The Board has repeatedly held that consolidation is inappropriate where, as here, the cases involve different units of employees and different factual backgrounds. *See e.g., Accent Maintenance Corporation*, 303 NLRB 294, 299-300 (1991) (denying a motion to consolidate cases where "the events of the Complaint are also distinct and involve separate issues of law and fact."); *Venture Packaging, Inc.*, 290 NLRB 1237, 1237 n.1 (1988) (denying a motion to consolidate cases

where the charging parties and the issues in the cases differed); *c.f. Beverly California Corporation,* 326 NLRB 232, 236 (1998) (involving the "unprecedented" consolidation of 17 cases but where each charge was against one corporation and its wholly-owned subsidiaries). In *United States Postal Service,* 263 NLRB 357, 367 (1982), the Board upheld the ALJ's denial of a motion to consolidate two cases dealing with different post office branches. The ALJ explained that there was no indication that the charging party in one case had any contact with the respondent or the officials involved in the other case. *Id.; see also, The Dow Chemical Company,* 250 NLRB 748, 748 n.1 (1980) ("The motion to consolidate is hereby denied inasmuch as the cases involve different units of employees and raise issues which, in view of the varying allegations of the complaint and different factual backgrounds, are best considered separately."); *King Broadcasting Company,* 324 NLRB 332, 339 n.12 (1997) (denying a motion for consolidation where the case dealt with "development of subtle and extensive labor-management dynamics").

Similarly here, the parties involved, the claims, and the disputed employment practices, all vary amongst Franchisees. To highlight but a few of these differences, the Restaurant's policy regarding employee breaks has no relation to similar policies implemented at restaurants across the country. Karavites' alleged reaction to, and the purported surveillance of, union demonstrations is factually distinct from what occurred with respect to other Franchisees. Individual conversations relating to the alleged solicitation of employee grievances that occurred on the premises of the Restaurant have no relation or bearing on the claims asserted against other Franchisees.

The resolution of these claims will require Karavites and the Board to examine a host of vary particularized testimony and evidence relating specifically to the Restaurant. For example, Karavites will need to put on evidence pertaining to: (1) the Restaurant's policy pertaining to

employee breaks; (2) individual conversations on the premises of the Restaurant that allegedy constitute threats or the solicitation of employee grievances in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act; and (3) the schedules of individual employees at the Restaurant and the attendant circumstances underlying the employee schedules. With the exception of Operator Karavites, the employees and supervisors in question do not work for any of the other Franchisee in this consolidated complaint. Moreover, the events in question are only alleged to have occurred at the Restaurant.

Indeed, each Franchisee in this consolidated complaint is addressing idiosyncratic claims. Even where the joint employer issue is concerned, determining liability for McDonald's will require individual examination of the company's relationships, involvement, and level of knowledge relevant to the claims against each Franchisee. It is difficult to imagine a more disparate set of cases and as such, the ALJ should sever cases brought against separate and distinct Franchisees.

III. Consolidation Prejudices Each Party's Ability To Mount A Defense In This Action

Consolidation of these cases violates due process in that it severely prejudices each Franchisee's ability to defend against the claims asserted. Courts considering the propriety of consolidation look at whether it "den[ies] a party his due process right to prosecute his own separate and distinct claims or defenses without having them so merged in the claims or defenses of others that irreparable injury will result." *Garber v. Randell*, 477 F.2d 711, 716-717 (2d Cir. 1973); *see also In re Repetitive Stress Injury Litig.*, 11 F.3d 368, 373 (2d Cir. 1993) ("Although consolidation may enhance judicial efficiency, 'considerations of convenience and economy must yield to a paramount concern for a fair and impartial trial.'"). In *Malcolm v. Nat'l Gypsum Co.,* the court reversed the district court's consolidation of asbestos litigation noting the "dizzying

amount of evidence" regarding each victim's work history, disease pathology, level of exposure, and location of exposure. *See Malcolm,* 995 F.2d 346, 349 (2d Cir. 1993); *see also Garber,* 477 F.2d at 716-717 (finding that consolidating the complaints of various plaintiff stockholders against numerous defendants presented issues of "serious prejudice" explaining that "to be joined with numerous unrelated claims by other purchasers against some 50-odd other defendants in one 'mixed bag' type of consolidated complaint would be fundamentally unfair…").

Here, the disparate issues involved and the sheer number of parties including 21 independent Franchisees, McDonald's, numerous Charging Parties, and countless witnesses create a due process concern. The presentation of evidence involving 61 unfair labor practice charges, and the case-by-case adjudication of McDonald's as a joint employer, threatens to overwhelm the evidence Karavites will present in its own defense. Further, there is great potential for confusion and conflation of the factual distinctions between the Restaurant and the other restaurants operated by 21 individual, independent franchisees. *See e.g., Arnold v. Eastern Air Lines,* 712 F.2d 899, 906 (4th Cir. 1983) (reversing a decision to consolidate cases and holding that "considerations of convenience may not prevail where the inevitable consequence to another party is harmful and serious prejudice."); *see also, Schneck v. IBM,* Case No. 92-4370 (GEB), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10126, at *18 (D.N.J. June 24, 1996) (denying a motion to consolidate explaining that "[t]he critical facts and factual issues are unique to each case, and a consolidation of these individual factual issues would result in inevitable jury confusion and a trial setting highly prejudicial to IBM."). How, as a practical matter, could a single ALJ possibly listen to evidence regarding purported violations of Section 8(a)(1) and 8(a)(3) of the Act at the Restaurant, and not be influenced by evidence regarding 30 or more restaurants across the country that should, as a legal matter, have no bearing on prospective liability at the Restaurant? While Karavites believes the

ALJ will attempt to remain objective throughout the proceedings, it cannot be denied that managing a trial of this magnitude, across the country for what will likely be years, and then issuing rulings in 61 different charges, will be an incredibly challenging task. And where consolidation is not justified by the benefits of added efficiencies, it becomes an entirely unnecessary exercise.

Further, Karavites will be delayed in the resolution of its case by being forced to participate in wholly irrelevant proceedings. "Consolidation that would unnecessarily delay [another] case is inappropriate." *Wai Feng Trading Co. v. Quick Fitting, Inc.*, Case No. 13-033S/13-056S, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117251, at *13 (D.R.I. May 30, 2014); *see also Accent Maintenance Corporation*, 303 NLRB at 300 (denying a motion to consolidate explaining that where a case was ripe for decision the parties "are entitled to have their respective rights and obligations determined with reasonable dispatch."). To cite one example, the alleged surveillance of union demonstrators that occurred on a single day could be heard and resolved in an expeditious manner. Rather than simply presenting its defenses and receiving a timely determination on the violation that allegedly occurred on this day, resolution of this claim **will be delayed for years** while the cases against McDonald's, McDonald's Restaurants of Illinois, Inc. and each independent Franchisee are litigated around the country. The General Counsel proposes that the same ALJ travel to New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles to preside over these proceedings. All the while, Karavites will be denied resolution on claims large and small, until this process concludes.

Karavites is also prejudiced by the additional time and cost that attending these protracted proceedings will require. The General Counsel's proposed regional phases of adjudication will result in an enormous expenditure for Karavites. The New York hearings alone will involve all of the consolidated cases in Region 2 and 4 which include 20 charges, 11 independent Franchisees, and adjudication of McDonald's as a joint employer with each. Karavites must have a presence

throughout the proceedings in order to present its defense, point out any relevant distinctions in the operation of its restaurant and its relationship with McDonald's, and participate in motion practice that may have a bearing on its case. The cost of this process compared to the small proportion of claims at issue specifically relating to Karavites, creates a substantial fairness issue.

The General Counsel's consolidation has also completely stymied settlement discussions. Karavites is being forced to litigate a case involving run-of-the-mill violations of Section 8(a)(1), and a relatively minor purported violation of Section 8(a)(3) relating to employee schedules, because the General Counsel is insistent on trying all joint employer cases together and will not permit Karavites to settle the case absent an admission by Karavites that it is a joint employer with McDonald's, which it is not. McDonald's has no authority to remedy the unfair labor practices at issue even if Karavites is found liable and the allegations don't involve any McDonald's employees or facilities that McDonald's operates. The joint employer issue is of such importance to Karavites and the viability of the franchise business model generally, that a required concession on this point effectively takes settlement off the table. Moreover, not only is Karavites being forced to litigate a case it would likely settle with a notice posting with little cost or delay to all parties in the absence of the General Counsel's joint-employer admission requirement, but Karavites is now being forced into a massive, complex trial involving dozens of unrelated corporate entities that will take years to resolve, the likes of which are unprecedented in any forum.

IV. Continued Consolidation Will Result In An Unmanageable Hearing Process Rife With Numerous Delays.

The General Counsel's decision to consolidate should be guided by concerns for "effectuat[ing] the purposes of the Act or avoid[ing] unnecessary costs or delay." Board Rule § 102.33(a). Here, there are no common issues of fact that would achieve the efficiencies of consolidation. Severance of the cases against each distinct Franchisee to allow them to proceed

separately will increase efficiency and avoid additional costs to the parties of participating in the litigation of wholly irrelevant issues. This type of consolidation, particularly where the cases do not involve a common set of facts or parties, will be completely unmanageable. At every stage of the hearing process, the consolidated cases will be susceptible to delay.[2]

The numerous parties involved will include counsel for each Franchisee, counsel for McDonald's, counsel for the General Counsel, and counsel for each of the Charging Parties. As stated previously, each of these parties will need to be present and participate at each stage of the consolidated proceedings in order to properly track the progress of the case and protect their interests throughout the hearing. Trial preparation will involve the exchange of likely millions of documents between the parties. The inevitable disputes over discovery will, no doubt, result in numerous delays to the overall proceedings.

Witnesses will need to be prepped to endure direct examination but also multiple rounds of cross examination as each involved party will be entitled to question each witness. Further, given the numerous parties involved, any motion practice during the proceedings will also result in delays as the ALJ will be reviewing motions from each party involved, in making her rulings. Finally, the post-hearing brief submissions of each party will delay final resolution of the various cases. Given the involvement of counsel for each Franchisee, counsel for McDonald's, counsel for the General Counsel, and counsel for each of the Charging Parties, there is the potential for more than 20 post-hearing briefs at the end of the proceedings. Severance of the cases such that all charges against a single Franchisee are consolidated with each other but not consolidated with

[2] *CNN America, Inc.*, Case Nos. 05-CA-31828 and 05-CA-33125, primarily involved whether CNN and its former subcontractor were joint employers under the Act. While this case concerned only two corporate entities and two unfair labor practice charges, it took 82 days to try and involved "16,000 pages of transcript and over 1300 exhibits." *CNN America, Inc.*, Case Nos. 05-CA-31828 and 05-CA-33125, 2008 WL 6524258, at *1 (N.L.R.B. Div. of Judges Nov. 19, 2008). This case was pending before the Board for over five years before the Board finally issued a decision on September 15, 2014. *See* 361 NLRB No. 47. By comparison, given the size of this case as currently consolidated, it is likely to take much longer than *CNN America, Inc.* to conclude.

charges involving separate and distinct Franchisees will decrease each of these inefficiencies and minimize the potential for delay to all of the parties.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Karavites Restaurants 11102, LLC respectfully requests the ALJ to order the severance of cases against each distinct Franchisee.

Dated: January 23, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Steve A. Miller

Steve A. Miller
James M. Hux, Jr.
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3450
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 346-8061
Facsimile: (312) 346-3179

Attorneys for Respondent
Karavites Restaurants 11102, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned attorney for Respondent **Karavites Restaurants 11102, LLC**, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of its **Motion to Sever** was electronically filed with the National Labor Relations Board on January 23, 2015, effectuating service on the NLRB's Regional Office.

I further certify that on January 23, 2015, a true and correct copy of **Karavites Restaurants 11102, LLC's Motion to Sever** was served via First Class U.S. mail, upon the following:

Gwynne Wilcox
Micah Wissinger
Michael Hickson
Vanessa Flores LEVY RATNER, P.C.
80 Eighth Avenue, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10011
gwilcox@levyratner.com
mwissinger@levyratner.com
mhickson@levyratner.com
vflores@levyratner.com

Geoffrey Dunham
Leah Z. Jaffe
National Labor Relations Board, Region 02
26 Federal Plaza, Suite 3614
New York, NY 10278-3699
geoffrey.dunham@nlrb.gov
leah.jaffe@nlrb.gov

Robert Brody
Abby Warren
BRODY & ASSOCIATES
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
rbrody@brodyandassociates.com
awarren@brodyandassociates.com

Karen Fernbach
Region Director
National Labor Relations Board - Region 02
26 Federal Plaza, Suite 3614
New York. NY 10278-3699
Karen.Fernbach@nlrb.gov

Fast Food Workers Committee
2-4 Nevins St., Second Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11217

Mary Carlson
1100 New York Avenue
Suite 500 West, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Judith A. Scott
General Counsel
Service Employees International Union
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1806
judy.scott@seiu.org

Pennsylvania Workers Organizing Committee
846 N. Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130

Michael J. Healy
HEALEY & I-IORNACK, P.C.
247 Fort Pitt Blvd., 4th Floor

Ceilidh Gao
Law Fellow
Service Employees International Union
1800 Massachusetts Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15222
mike@unionlawyers.net

Dennis P. Walsh
Regional Director
National Relations Labor Board - Region 04 615 Chestnut Street, 7th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-4404
dennis.walsh@nlrb.gov

Barry M. Bennett
George A. Luscombe, III
DOWD, BLOCH, BENNETT & CERVONE
8 S. Michigan Ave, Fl. 19
Chicago, IL 60603-3315
bbennett@dbb-law.com
gluscombe@dbb-law.com

Matthew Egan
David J. Stein
PRETZEL & STOUFFER
One South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, IL 60606-4708
megan@pretzel-stouffer.com
dstein@pretzel-stouffer.com

Jeffrey A. Macey
MACEY SWANSON AND ALLMAN
445 N Pennsylvania St., Ste 401
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1893
jmacey@maceylaw.com

Andrew W. Gruber
William J. Kishman
BINGHAM GREENEBAUM DOLL LLP
2700 Market Tower
10 West Market Street

Washington, DC 20036-1806
ceilidh.gao@seiu.org

Joseph A. Hirsch
HIRSCH & HIRSCH One Belmont Avenue 8th Floor, Suite 8001
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
ahirsch@hirschfirm.com

Gina M. LiVolsi
Brian J. Sharpe
Caralyn M. Olie
Susan M. Troester
Terrill Pierce
LAPOINTE LAW, P.C.
1200 Shermer Road, Suite 310
Northbrook, IL 60062-4500
glivolsi@lapointelaw.net
bsharpe@lapointelaw.net
collie@lapointelaw.net
stroester@lapointelaw.net
tpierce@lapointelaw.net

Peter Sung Ohr
Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board, Region 13
209 South La Salle Street, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60604-1443
peter.ohr@nlrb.gov

Christopher Busey
Amanda A. Sonneborn
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
131 S. Dearborn St., Suite 2400
Chicago, IL 60603-5577
cbusey@seyfarth.com
asonneborn@seyfarth.com

Rik Lineback
Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board, Region 25
575 N Pennsylvania St. Ste 238
Indianapolis, IN 46205-1520

Indianapolis, IN 46204
agruber@bgdlegal.com
wkishman@bgdlegal.com

Workers Organizing Committee of Chicago
123 W Madison St., Ste 800
Chicago, IL 60602-4621

Roger Crawford
Best, Best & Krieger
2855 E. Guasti Road, Suite 400
Ontario CA, 91761
Roger.Crawford@bbklaw.com

Sean Graham
Weinberg Roger & Rosenfeld 800
Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1320
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2623
sgraham@unioncounsel.net

Alfred De La Cruz Vi Applen
MANNING & KASS, ELROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP
801 S Figueroa St., Fl 15
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5504
amd@manningllp.com
vna@manningllp.com

Brian D. Gee
Acting Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board, Region 31
11500 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90064
brian.gee@nlrb.gov

rik.lineback@nlrb.gov

Thomas O'Connell Best, Best & Krieger
3390 University Avenue, 5th Floor
Riverside CA, 92501
Thomas.00onnell@bbklaw.com

Joseph F. Frankl
Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board, Region 20
901 Market Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
joseph.frankl@nlrb.gov

Jonathan Cohen
Eli Naduris-Weissman
ROTHNER, SEGALL & GREENSTONE
510 South Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101-3115
jcohen@rsglabor.com
enaduris-weissman@rsglabor.com

Mori Rubin
Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board, Region 31
11500 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90064
mori.rubin@nlrb.gov

/s/ Steve A. Miller
Steve A. Miller