

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**

AMBASSADOR SERVICES, INC.	Cases Nos. 12-CA-26758, 12-CA-26759, 12-CA-26832
AMERICAN BAPTIST HOMES OF THE WEST d/b/a PIEDMONT GARDENS	Case No. 32-CA-063475
BANNER HEALTH SYSTEM d/b/a BANNER ESTRELLA MEDICAL CENTER	Case No. 28-CA-23438
COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION	Case No. 34-CA-12421
DIRECTV U.S. DIRECTTV HOLDINGS, LLC	Case No. 21-CA-39546
FRED MEYER STORES, INC.	Case No. 36-CA-10555
FRESENIUS USA MANUFACTURING, INC.	Case No. 2-CA-39518
IRONTIGER LOGISTICS, INC.	Case No. 16-CA-27543
SODEXO AMERICA, LLC	Case Nos. 21-CA-39086, 21-CA- 39109, 21-CA-39328, 21-CA- 39403
SUPPLY TECHNOLOGIES, LLC	Case No. 18-CA-19587

**MOTION OF THE COALITION FOR A DEMOCRATIC WORKPLACE**

**REQUESTING THE BOARD TO INVITE *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEFS IN  
TEN CASES REMANDED PURSUANT TO *NOEL CANNING***

Maurice Baskin  
Michael J. Lotito  
Littler Mendelson P.C.  
1150 17th Street, NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20036  
[mbaskin@littler.com](mailto:mbaskin@littler.com)

Elizabeth Parry  
Littler Mendelson P.C.  
1255 Treat Boulevard  
Suite 600  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597  
[mparry@littler.com](mailto:mparry@littler.com)

Attorneys for the Movant  
COALITION FOR A DEMOCRATIC WORKPLACE

## I. GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION

The undersigned attorneys represent the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace (“CDW”), which consists of over 600 organizations representing millions of businesses employing hundreds of millions of employees nationwide in nearly every industry. We are writing on behalf of the CDW to ask the Board to invite *amicus* briefs from interested parties in at least ten of the cases that have been remanded to the Board in the aftermath of the Supreme Court’s decision in *NLRB v. Noel Canning*, 134 S. Ct. 2550 (2014). The ten cases in which we are asking The Board to invite *amicus* briefs are as follows:

*Ambassador Services, Inc.*, Case Nos. 12-CA-26758, 26759, 26832

*American Baptist Homes of the West*, Case No. 32-CA-063475

*Banner Health System*, Case No. 28-CA-23438

*Costco Wholesale Corporation*, Case No. 34-CA-12421

*DirectTV U.S. DirectTV Holding, LLC*, Case No. 21-CA-39546

*Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.*, Case No. 36-CA- 10555

*Fresenius USA Manufacturing, Inc.*, Case No. 2-CA-39518

*Iron Tiger Logistics, Inc.*, Case No. 16-CA-27543

*Sodexo America, LLC*, Case Nos. 21-CA-39086, 39109, 39328, 39403

*Supply Technologies, LLC*, Case No. 18-CA-19587.

Each of the foregoing decisions was issued by a Board that included one or more invalidly appointed “recess” members, in violation of the Supreme Court’s holding in *Noel Canning* (hereafter the “recess” Board). The “recess” Board’s initial decisions in each of these cases significantly modified, expanded upon or overruled past precedent, establishing new principles of labor law. The decisions impacted critical workplace issues affecting millions of

employers and employees across many different industries. The issues raised by the decisions, as specified in greater detail below, include the application of Section 7 to social media, confidentiality of workplace investigations and witness statements, the need to harmonize Board rulings with other state and federal laws governing the workplace, employee and union access to employers' premises, the enforceability of arbitration requirements encouraged by the Federal Arbitration Act, and employer responses to union information requests.

Because the "recess" Board's initial decisions in the foregoing cases were rendered through the *ad hoc* adjudication process, there was little or no advance indication to the public that the Board was considering significant changes to existing law or restatements of important labor policies, prior to issuance of the decisions themselves. As a result, the "recess" Board did not have the benefit of *amicus* participation from organizations representing the broader business or labor community or academia, in any of these proceedings.

During the past year, however, the current Board has taken the welcome step of inviting *amicus* briefs in a number of cases where the Board announced that it was considering potentially significant changes in law or policy. *See, e.g., Northwestern University*, Case No. 13-RC-121359; *Browning Ferris Industries*, Case No. 32-RC-109684; and *Purple Communications, Inc.*, Case Nos. 21-CA-095141, 21-RC-091531, 21-RC-091584. By publicly announcing the potential policy changes being considered, and then issuing invitations for *amicus* briefs on such issues, the Board has insured that the broader views of business, labor and academia could be considered and addressed, beyond the narrow interests of the immediate parties to each case.

The same principle should apply here under the highly unusual circumstances created by the mass remand of cases by the courts of appeals under *Noel Canning*. In the ten above

captioned cases, the “recess” Board’s decisions that are now being reconsidered by the current Board all announced significant changes in law or policy. As in the more recent cases where similar changes have been considered by the current Board, the Board would benefit from hearing the broader views of business, labor and academia as to the legality and impact of the changes advocated by the “recess” Board.<sup>1</sup>

As an alternative to the Board’s issuance of invitations to file *amicus* briefs to the broader business and labor community, CDW requests leave to file as an *amicus* in each of the above referenced cases. CDW believes that the Board would benefit from inviting more than one *amicus* brief, however.

## **II. SUMMARY OF THE REMANDED CASES IN WHICH AN INVITATION FOR *AMICI* BRIEFING IS REQUESTED.**

### **A. *American Baptist Homes of the West d/b/a Piedmont Gardens*, 359 NLRB No. 46 (December 15, 2012).**

In this case, the recess majority, Griffin and Block, held that the employer violated the Act by failing to provide a union with the names and job titles of employees who witnessed alleged work misconduct resulting in an employee’s termination. The majority found that the employer did not establish a legitimate and substantial confidentiality interest in the witnesses’ names and job titles. Member Hayes dissented. The Griffin and Block majority overturned 34 year old precedent exempting witness statements from an employer’s general duty to provide relevant information. See *Anheuser-Busch*, 237 NLRB 982 (1978). The majority rejected *Anheuser-Busch*’s bright-line rule and the underlying premise that witness statements are

---

<sup>1</sup> The foregoing list of cases is not intended to be an exclusive list of remanded Board rulings that are important to the business community. CDW encourages the Board to invite *amicus* filings prior to reaffirming any remanded decision that modified or overturned previous Board precedent.

fundamentally different from other types of information.

If the “recess” Board’s holding is reaffirmed by the current Board, employers will be left without guidance on what fact specific situations the Board will find sufficient to deny disclosure under the new balancing test. This case also creates an unnecessary burden on employers’ ability to comply with other federal labor and employment laws. The Board should invite *amicus* briefs in this case to receive the broader views of interested parties regarding the impact of the holding on the process of conducting fair workplace investigations.

**B. *Ambassador Services, Inc.*, 358 NLRB No. 130 (September 14, 2012).**

“Recess” Board members Griffin and Block, Member Hayes dissenting, found a stevedoring company violated the Act by maintaining a work rule that prohibited “walking off the job and/or leaving the premises during work hours without permission.” The ALJ found that the rule was justified by the business necessity of ensuring that supervisors knew where employees were at all times. He further concluded that no employee would reasonably read the rule as nullifying the right to strike. The “recess” Board reversed the ALJ and found that employees would reasonably construe the rule prohibiting “walking off the job” as prohibiting protected “walk outs.” The “recess” Board thereby improperly narrowed the precedent upholding such policies in *Wilshire at Lakewood*, 343 NLRB 141 (2004), *revd. on other grounds Jochims v. NLRB*, 480 F.3d 1161 (D.C. Cir. 2007). The Board should invite *amici* to address the impact of the “recess” Board’s holding on the rights of employers to promulgate reasonable rules about breaks, shifts, and job abandonment, all of which are necessary to maintain productive and secure workplace environments, regardless of the industry involved.

**C. *Banner Estrella Medical Center d/b/a Banner Health System*, 358 NLRB No. 93 (July 20, 2012).**

In this case, recess Members Richard Griffin and Sharon Block, Member Hayes dissenting, found an employer's routine instruction to employees not to discuss ongoing employee investigations unlawful. The majority placed a new burden on the employer "to first determine whether in any given investigation witnesses needed protection, evidence was in danger of being destroyed, testimony was in danger of being fabricated, or there was a need to prevent a cover up" before requiring confidentiality. This holding ignores the realities of workplace investigations and interferes with employers' ability to comply with federal and state laws requiring confidential investigation of workplace misconduct. The Board should invite *amici* to address the need for confidentiality in workplace investigations and the impracticality of requiring individualized showings of need under the restrictive holding of the recess Board, as well as the unreasonable burdens involved in complying with the foregoing holding while maintaining compliance with the legal requirements imposed by other federal agencies.

**D. *Costco Wholesale Corporation*, 358 NLRB No. 106 (September 7, 2012).**

The "recess" Board panel, Pearce, Griffin and Block, reversed the ALJ and held that the company's social media policy prohibiting statements that "damage the Company" or "damage any person's reputation" violated the Act. The Board found that employees would reasonably conclude that the rule prohibited them from making statements critical of the employer or its agents. In light of the proliferation of social media policies, and the confusing series of Board and General Counsel decisions pertaining to their enforcement, the Board should invite *amicus* briefs in this case in order to fully reassess the validity of social media policies and to provide clear guidance consistent with the Act. The holding in this case represents a departure from

previous precedent finding that employers have legitimate right to adopt rules establishing a civil and decent work place and that rules prohibiting improper conduct tending to damage or discredit an employer's reputation were lawful. See *Palms Hotel & Casino*, 344 NLRB 1363 (2005); *Lafayette Park Hotel*, 326 NLRB 824, 828 (1998) *enf.* 203 F.3d 52 (D.C. Cir. 1999); *Tradesmen International*, 338 NLRB 460 (2002).

**E. *DirectTV U.S. DirectTV Holdings LLC*, 359 NLRB No. 54 (January 25, 2013).**

The “recess” Board panel, Pearce, Griffin and Block, held that rules prohibiting employees from contacting the media, commenting to the media about DirectTV, and responding to law enforcement inquiries without first contacting DirectTV’s security department, were unlawful because employees would reasonably construe the rules as prohibiting Section 7 activity. The “recess” Board improperly found that the rules encompassed protected employee communications concerning labor disputes to the media and contact with law enforcement officials regarding wages, hours and working conditions. The “recess” Board also found unlawful employer policies prohibiting employees from discussing details about their job, company business, work projects, employee information, and employee records. The Board should invite *amici* to file briefs in order to gain a better understanding of how such commonplace policies serve legitimate business interests without infringing on any reasonable employees’ Section 7 rights.

**F. *Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.*, 359 NLRB No. 34 (December 13, 2012).**

In this case, the recess majority of Pearce and Griffin, with Member Hayes dissenting, held that a retail store unlawfully changed a past practice of allowing non-employee union representatives to have short conversations with employees on the selling floor when the

employees were not assisting store customers. The union activities in question significantly exceeded past practice and constituted trespass in violation of the employer's property rights, in violation of the Supreme Court's holding in *Lechmere, Inc. v. NLRB*, 502 U.S. 527 (1992). The Board should invite *amici* to address the impact of the recess Board's holding on retail employers, as well as the practical applications of such a holding on other industries and the infringement on employer property rights protected by *Lechmere*.

**G. *Fresenius USA Manufacturing, Inc.* 358 NLRB No. 138 (September 19, 2012).**

Recess Members Griffin and Block, Member Hayes dissenting, in this case reversed the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") and held that the employer violated the NLRA when it suspended and terminated the employee for writing offensive and threatening newsletter comments and lying during the investigation of his misconduct. Expanding the Board's previous application of *Atlantic Steel*, the majority found the employee's use of vulgar language protected merely because his comments concerned union activity, a decertification election. *Atlantic Steel Co.*, 245 NLRB 814, 816 (1979). The Board should invite *amicus* briefs in this case in order to learn from the business community how the ability to discipline and discharge employees for egregious workplace conduct such as occurred in this case directly relates to the legitimate business interests in providing a safe workplace and complying with federal and state anti-discrimination and harassment laws. Complying with the recess Board's new requirements in this case will leave many employers open to potential liability under other relevant labor and employment laws, which the Board is obligated to take into account in rendering its decisions under the NLRA.

**H. *IronTiger Logistics, Inc., 359 NLRB No. 13 (October 23, 2012).***

The recess majority, Pearce and Block, held that the employer in this case was required to respond in a timely fashion to the union's request for information that was not relevant to a grievance. Member Hayes dissented, citing Supreme Court precedent in *NLRB v. Truitt Manufacturing*, “while it might be preferable for a party to explain its refusal to provide information which is irrelevant to the statutory bargaining, it is not a violation of the statutory duty to bargain in good faith to fail to do so.” See *NLRB v. Truitt Manufacturing*, 351 U.S. 149 (1956). He noted that the Board had never previously found an independent statutory duty to respond to a request for presumptively relevant information, where that presumption was rebutted in litigation. The Board should invite *amici* briefing of the burdensome impact of this holding on the business community, which will now be faced with the requirement to respond to multiple information requests that are not relevant to a union’s performance of its responsibilities as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative.

**I. *Sodexo America LLC, 358 NLRB No. 79 (July 3, 2012).***

This decision invalidated an employer rule restricting off-duty access to its hospital because it discriminatorily allowed access for “hospital-related business.” The “recess” Board reversed the ALJ’s decision, which relied on 36 year old precedent in *Tri-County Medical Center*, 222 NLRB 1089 (1976). In *Tri-County Medical Center*, the Board held that an employer’s rule barring an employee’s off-duty access to the facility was valid if it limits access solely to the interior of the facility, is clearly disseminated to all employees, and applies to off-

duty access for all purposes, not just for union activity. The “recess” Board instead found the employer’s policy provided management with too much discretion to permit, or not permit, employees to enter its facility. Member Hayes dissented and agreed with the ALJ that the rule was valid under *Tri-County Medical Center*. The Board should invite *amici* to address the impact of this holding on employers’ reasonable workplace access restrictions and whether holding needlessly interferes with patient care.

**J. *Supply Technologies, LLC*, 359 NLRB No. 38 (December 14, 2012).**

The recess majority, Griffin and Block, with Member Hayes dissenting, found that a non-union employer’s mandatory arbitration policy violated the Act by requiring arbitration of any federal, state or local statutory claims, without expressly designating NLRB complaints as exempt from the program. The opinion asserted, without support, that the policy would cause reasonable employees to believe that they were prohibited from filing unfair labor practice charges. This decision completely ignores relevant federal and Supreme Court case law requiring arbitration agreements to be enforced as written and elevates the NLRA over the Federal Arbitration Act’s strong federal policy favoring arbitration. See *D.R. Horton, Inc. v. N.L.R.B.*, 737 F.3d 344, 350 (5th Cir. 2013); *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 131 S. Ct. 1740 (2011); *American Express Corp. v. Italian Colors Restaurant*, 133 S. Ct. 2304 (2013). The Board should invite *amici* to address the broader impact of this decision on arbitration policies and the reasonable expectations of employees with regard to the enforcement of such policies.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the CDW respectfully requests that the Board invite *amicus* briefs in each of the above cases in order to obtain a greater understanding of the impact of the recess Board's previous changes in labor policy on the broader interests of business and labor and the rule of law. Alternatively, CDW itself requests leave to file *amicus* briefs in each of the cited cases within 30 days after issuance of a ruling on this Motion.

Dated: October 9, 2014



---

Maurice Baskin  
Michael J. Lotito  
Elizabeth D. Parry  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
Attorneys for the Movant  
COALITION FOR A DEMOCRATIC  
WORKPLACE

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2  
3 I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a  
4 party to the within action. My business address is Treat Towers, 1255 Treat Boulevard, Suite 600,  
5 Walnut Creek, California 94597. On October 9, 2014, I served the within document(s):

6 MOTION OF THE COALITION FOR A DEMOCRATIC  
7 WORKPLACE – REQUESTING THE BOARD TO INVITE  
8 *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEFS IN TEN CASES REMANDED  
9 PURSUANT TO NOEL CANNING

10  by facsimile transmission at or about \_\_\_\_\_ on that date. This document  
11 was transmitted by using a facsimile machine that complies with California Rules  
12 of Court Rule 2003(3), telephone number 925.946.9809. The transmission was  
13 reported as complete and without error. A copy of the transmission report, properly  
14 issued by the transmitting machine, is attached. The names and facsimile numbers  
15 of the person(s) served are as set forth below.

16  by placing a true copy of the document(s) listed above for collection and mailing  
17 following the firm’s ordinary business practice in a sealed envelope with postage  
18 thereon fully prepaid for deposit in the United States mail at Walnut Creek,  
19 California addressed as set forth below.

20  by depositing a true copy of the same enclosed in a sealed envelope, with delivery  
21 fees provided for, in an overnight delivery service pick up box or office designated  
22 for overnight delivery, and addressed as set forth below.

23  by personally delivering a copy of the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at  
24 the address(es) set forth below.

25  Based on Board rules requiring service in the same manner documents are filed, I  
26 caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses on the  
27 attached service list on the dates and at the times stated thereon. I did not receive,  
28 within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other  
indication that the transmission was unsuccessful. The electronic notification  
address of the person making the service is mamartinez@littler.com.

American Baptist Homes of the West d/b/a Piedmont Gardens v. The Service Employees  
International Union, United Healthcare Workers – West – Case No. 32-CA-063475

Noah J. Garber / William A Baudler National Labor Relations Board – General Counsel 1301 Clay Street, Suite 300N Oakland, CA 94612 <u>Noah.garber@nlrb.gov</u> <u>William.baudler@nlrb.gov</u>	David S. Durham, Esq. Gilbert J. Tsai, Esq. Arnold & Porter LLP 7th Floor, Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4024 <u>David.durham@aporter.com</u> <u>Gilbert.tsai@aporter.com</u>
--	--

(No. )

1 2 3	Manuel A. Boigues Weinberg, Roger, & Rosenfeld 1001 Marina Village Pkwy, Ste. 200 Alameda, CA 94501-6430 <a href="mailto:mboigues@unioncounsel.net">mboigues@unioncounsel.net</a>	Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary NLRB 1099 14th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20570 Via e-filing
-------------	---	---

Banner Health Systems d/b/a Banner Estrella Medical Center v. James Navarro, an Individual  
Case No. 28-CA-23438

4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mark, G. Kisicki Elizabeth M. Townsend, Esq. Ogletree Deakins Nash Smoak And Steward PC Collier Center Suite 1600 201 East Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85004 <a href="mailto:Mark.kisicki@ogletreedeakins.com">Mark.kisicki@ogletreedeakins.com</a> <a href="mailto:Elizabeth.townsend@ogletreedeakins.com">Elizabeth.townsend@ogletreedeakins.com</a>	James Navarro 3636 W. Keim Drive Phoenix, AZ 85019-1721 <a href="mailto:Mason2pa@yahoo.com">Mason2pa@yahoo.com</a>
----------------------------------	---	---

11 12 13 14	Counsel for the Acting General Counsel National Labor Relations Board, Region 28 2600 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800 Phoenix, AZ 85004 T: 602-640-2118 F: 602-640-2178 <a href="mailto:William.Mabry@nlrb.gov">William.Mabry@nlrb.gov</a>	Cornele A. Overstreet Regional Director Region 28 National Labor Relations Board 2600 North Central Avenue, Ste. 1800 Phoenix, AZ 85004-3099 <a href="mailto:Cornele.Overstreet@nlrb.gov">Cornele.Overstreet@nlrb.gov</a>
----------------------	---	---

15 16 17 18	Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary NLRB 1099 14th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20570 Via e-filing	
----------------------	---	--

Costco Wholesale Corporation v. United Food And Commercial Workers, Local 371  
Case No. 34-CA-12421

19 20 21 22 23	Paul Galligan David B. Ross Seyfarth Shaw LLP 620 8th Avenue New York, NY 10018-1669 <a href="mailto:pgalligan@seyfarth.com">pgalligan@seyfarth.com</a>	Nicholas W. Clark, General Counsel UFCW 1775 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-1502 <a href="mailto:nclark@ufcw.org">nclark@ufcw.org</a>
----------------------------	--	--

24 25 26 27	Rick Concepcion, Esq. Counsel for the General Counsel National Labor Relations Board, Region 34 280 Trumbull Street, 21st Floor Hartford, CT 16103 <a href="mailto:Rick.concepcion@nlrb.gov">Rick.concepcion@nlrb.gov</a>	Local 371, UFCW 290 Post Road West Westport, CT 06880 <a href="mailto:ufcwoffice@aol.com">ufcwoffice@aol.com</a>
----------------------	--	---

1 Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary  
2 NLRB  
3 1099 14th Street N.W.  
4 Washington, D.C. 20570  
Via e-filing

5 DirectTV U.S. DirectTV Holdings LLC v. International Association Of Machinists And Aerospace  
6 Workers, District Lodge 947 AFL-CIO  
7 Case No. 21-CA-39546

8 Gregory D. Wolflick  
9 Wolflick & Simpson  
10 130 N. Brand Blvd. Ste. 410  
11 Glendale, CA 91203-2689  
12 [greg@wolfsim.com](mailto:greg@wolfsim.com)

David A. Rosenfeld  
Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld  
1001 Marina Village Pkwy, Ste. 200  
Alameda, CA 94501-1091  
[drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net](mailto:drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net)

11 James F. Small, Regional Director  
12 National Labor Relations Board, Region 21  
13 888 South Figueroa Street, Ninth Floor  
14 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5449  
15 [Jean.libby@nlrb.gov](mailto:Jean.libby@nlrb.gov)

Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary  
NLRB  
1099 14th Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Via e-filing

16 Fred Meyer Stores, Inc. v. United Food & Commercial Workers, Local 555, affiliated with United  
17 Food And Commercial Workers International Union  
18 Case No. 36-CA-10555

17 John Fawley  
18 NLRB, Region 19  
19 2948 Jackson Federal Building  
20 915 Second Avenue  
21 Seattle, WA 98174-1078  
22 206-220-6326  
23 [John.fawley@nlrb.gov](mailto:John.fawley@nlrb.gov)

John S. Bishop  
McKanna Bishop Joffe & Sullivan  
1635 NW Johnson Street  
Portland, OR 97209  
[jbishop@mbjlaw.com](mailto:jbishop@mbjlaw.com)

21 Richard J. Alli, Esq.  
22 Jennifer A. Sabovik, Esq.  
23 Bullard, Smith, Jernstedt & Wilson  
24 1000 S.W. Broadway, Suite 1900  
25 Portland, OR 97205  
[ralli@bullardlaw.com](mailto:ralli@bullardlaw.com)  
[jsabovik@bullardlaw.com](mailto:jsabovik@bullardlaw.com)

Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary  
NLRB  
1099 14th Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Via e-filing

1 Fresenius USA Manufacturing, Inc. v. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 445

2 Case No.2-CA-39518

3 Thomas G. Servodidio  
4 Sarah M. Boyer  
5 30 South 17th Street  
6 Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196  
7 215-979-1000  
8 [TGServodidio@duanemorris.com](mailto:TGServodidio@duanemorris.com)

Gary Shiners, Executive Secretary  
NLRB  
1099 14th Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Via e-filing

9 Irontiger Logistics, Inc. v. International Association of Machinists And Aerospace Workers, AFL-  
CIO

10 Case No. 16-CA-27543

11 Thomas Krukowski  
12 Krukowski & Costello, S.C.  
13 7111 West Edgerton Avenue  
14 Milwaukee, WI 53228-0999  
15 [tpk@kclegal.com](mailto:tpk@kclegal.com)

William Haller  
Associate General Counsel  
International Association of Machinists  
and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW)  
9000 Machinists Place  
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772-2687  
[whaller@iamaw.org](mailto:whaller@iamaw.org)

16 Kelly Elifson  
17 Counsel for the General Counsel  
18 National Labor Relations Board  
19 Region 16  
20 819 Taylor Street, Room 8A24  
21 Fort Worth, TX 76102-6178  
22 [Kelly.elifson@nrlb.gov](mailto:Kelly.elifson@nrlb.gov)

Gary Shiners, Executive Secretary  
NLRB  
1099 14th Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Via e-filing

1 Sodexo America LLC and Patricia Ortega, an Individual – Case No. 21-CA-39086

2 Sodexo America LLC; and USC University Hospital v. Service Workers United  
3 Case No. 21-CA-39109

4 USC University Hospital v. National Union of Healthcare Workers  
5 Case Nos. 21-CA-39328 / 21-CA-39403

6 Linda Van Winkle Deacon 1107 Fair Oaks Avneue #356 7 South Pasadena, CA 90017 T: 213-248-4806 / F: 818-952-7402 8 <a href="mailto:lindaedeacon@gmail.com">lindaedeacon@gmail.com</a> Attorney for Respondent 9 Keck Hospital of USC, formerly known as USC 10 University Hospital	Ms. Patricia Ortega 2107 Common Wealth Avenue, Apt. D-369 Alhambra, CA 91803 <a href="mailto:Opatricia491@gmail.com">Opatricia491@gmail.com</a>
11 Mark T. Bennett, Esq. Marks, Finch, Thornton & Baird, LLP 12 4747 Executive Dr., Suite 700 San Diego, CA 92121-3107 13 <a href="mailto:mbennett@mftb.com">mbennett@mftb.com</a>	Alice Garfield, Region 21 National Labor Relations Board 888 South Figueroa Street, Ninth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017-5449 T: 213-894-3011 / F: 213-894-2778 <a href="mailto:Alice.garfield@nlrb.gov">Alice.garfield@nlrb.gov</a>
15 Florice O. Hoffman, Esq. Law Offices of Florice Hoffman 16 8502 Each Chapman Avenue, #353 Orange, CA 92869 17 T: 714-282-1179 / F: 714-282-7918 18 <a href="mailto:fhoffman@socal.rr.com">fhoffman@socal.rr.com</a>	Bruce A. Harland, Esq. Weinberg, Roger, & Rosenfeld 1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200 Alameda, CA 94501 T: 510-337-1001 <a href="mailto:bharland@unioncounsel.net">bharland@unioncounsel.net</a>
19 Antonio Orea National Union of Healthcare Workers 20 8502 East Chapman Avenue, Suite 353 Orange, CA 92869 21 <a href="mailto:Aorea09@gmail.com">Aorea09@gmail.com</a>	Gary Shinnars, Executive Secretary NLRB 1099 14th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20570 Via e-filing

23 Supply Technologies, LLC v. Teamsters Local 120 - Case No. 18-CA-19587

24 Catherine Homolka Counsel for the General Counsel 25 National Labor Relations Board Suite 790, 330 South Second Avenue 26 Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55401 27 <a href="mailto:Catherine.homolka@nlrb.gov">Catherine.homolka@nlrb.gov</a>	T. Rhys Ledger Director of Organizing and Government Affairs Teamsters Local 120 9422 Ulysses Street N.E. Blaine, Minnesota 55434 <a href="mailto:rledger@teamsterslocal120.org">rledger@teamsterslocal120.org</a>
---	---

1 2 3 4	Michael Beyer, Branch Manager Supply Technologies, LLC 4837 Azelia Avenue North Minneapolis, MN 55429-3843 <a href="mailto:Mike.beyer@supplytechnologies.com">Mike.beyer@supplytechnologies.com</a>	Patrick J. Hoban, Attorney Zashin & Rich Co., L.P.A. 55 Public Square, 4th Floor Cleveland, OH 44113 <a href="mailto:pjh@zrlaw.com">pjh@zrlaw.com</a>
5 6 7 8	T. Rhys Ledger, Director of Organizing & Govt. Affairs Teamsters Local 120 9422 Ulysses Street N.E. Blaine, MN 55434 <a href="mailto:rledger@teamsterslocal120.org">rledger@teamsterslocal120.org</a>	Adrianna Shannon, Attorney 4600 IDS Center 80 South 8th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 <a href="mailto:Shannon@nka.com">Shannon@nka.com</a>
9 10 11	Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary NLRB 1099 14th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20570 Via e-filing	
12 13 14	Ambassador Services, Inc. v. International Longshoremen's Association, Locals 1922 and 1359, AFL-CIO and Eric Swanson - Cases 12-CA-26758 / 12-CA-26759 / 12-CA-26832	
15 16 17 18	Daniel M. Shea, Esq. Matthew T. Gomes, Esq. Nelson, Mullins, Riley & Scarborough, LLP 201 17th Street, NW, Suite 1700 Atlanta, Georgia 30363 <a href="mailto:Daniel.Shea@nelsonmullins.com">Daniel.Shea@nelsonmullins.com</a> <a href="mailto:Matthew.gomes@nelsonmullins.com">Matthew.gomes@nelsonmullins.com</a>	Neil Flaxman, Esq. 80 Southwest 8th Street Suite 3100 Miami, Florida 33130 <a href="mailto:flaxy@bellsouth.net">flaxy@bellsouth.net</a>
19 20 21	Christopher Zerby, Esq. Field Attorney National Labor Relations Board Region 12 <a href="mailto:Christopher.zerby@nlrb.gov">Christopher.zerby@nlrb.gov</a>	Eric Swanson <a href="mailto:Ericswanson321@live.ca">Ericswanson321@live.ca</a>
22 23 24 25	Rochelle Kentov Regional Director National Labor Relations Board Region 12 <a href="mailto:Rochelle.kentov@nlrb.gov">Rochelle.kentov@nlrb.gov</a>	Gary Shinnors, Executive Secretary NLRB 1099 14th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20570 Via e-filing

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing and for shipping via overnight delivery service. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service or if an overnight delivery service shipment,

1 deposited in an overnight delivery service pick-up box or office on the same day with postage or fees  
2 thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business.

3 I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at  
4 whose direction the service was made. Executed on October 9, 2014, at Walnut Creek, California.

5   
6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 Monica A. Martinez

8 Firmwide:128950127.1 076121.1004

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28