

jackson lewis

Attorneys at Law

Representing Management Exclusively in Workplace Law and Related Litigation

Jackson Lewis P.C.
220 Headquarters Plaza
East Tower, 7th Floor
Morristown, NJ 07960-6834
Tel 973 538-6890
Fax 973 540-9015
www.jacksonlewis.com
Richard J. Cino - Managing Shareholder

ALBANY, NY	GRAND RAPIDS, MI	NAPA, CA	RALEIGH-DURHAM, NC
ALBUQUERQUE, NM	GREENVILLE, SC	NEW ORLEANS, LA	RAPID CITY, SD
ATLANTA, GA	HARTFORD, CT	NEW YORK, NY	RICHMOND, VA
AUSTIN, TX	HOUSTON, TX	NORFOLK, VA	SACRAMENTO, CA
BALTIMORE, MD	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	OMAHA, NE	SAINT LOUIS, MO
BIRMINGHAM, AL	JACKSONVILLE, FL	ORANGE COUNTY, CA	SAN DIEGO, CA
BOSTON, MA	LAS VEGAS, NV	ORLANDO, FL	SAN FRANCISCO, CA
CHICAGO, IL	LONG ISLAND, NY	OVERLAND PARK, KS	SAN JUAN, PR
CINCINNATI, OH	LOS ANGELES, CA	PHILADELPHIA, PA	SEATTLE, WA
CLEVELAND, OH	MEMPHIS, TN	PHOENIX, AZ	STAMFORD, CT
DALLAS, TX	MIAMI, FL	PITTSBURGH, PA	TAMPA, FL
DAYTON, OH	MILWAUKEE, WI	PORTLAND, OR	WASHINGTON, DC REGION
DENVER, CO	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	PORTSMOUTH, NH	WHITE PLAINS, NY
DETROIT, MI	MORRISTOWN, NJ	PROVIDENCE, RI	

JUSTIN B. CUTLIP
EMAIL ADDRESS: cutlipj@jacksonlewis.com

April 23, 2015

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Ms. Linda J. Dreeben
Deputy Associate General Counsel
Appellate and Supreme Court Litigation Branch
Office of General Counsel
National Labor Relations Board
1099 14th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20570-0001

APPELLATE COURT BRANCH
NLRB
2014 APR 29 AM 5:44
LITIGATION SERVICES
WASH. D.C.

Re: FedEx Freight v. NLRB (8th Circuit)


Dear Ms. Dreeben:

Attached please find a court-stamped copy of a Petition for Review of the decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board in *FedEx Freight, Inc.*, 362 NLRB No. 74 (April 20, 2015) filed with the 8th Circuit.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON LEWIS P.C.



Justin B. Cutlip

Enclosures

cc: James F. Wallington, Esq. (via certified and regular mail)
Ashley L. Banks, Board Attorney Region 10, Subregion 11 (via certified and regular mail)
Claude T. Harrell, Regional Director Region 10, Subregion (via certified and regular mail)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

FEDEX FREIGHT, INC.)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	PETITION FOR REVIEW
)	
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

Pursuant to Rule 15(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Section 10(f) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 160(f), FedEx Freight, Inc., Petitioner, hereby petitions the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit for review of the Decision and Order of the National Labor Relations Board entered on April 20, 2015, in the matter of *FedEx Freight, Inc. and International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 71*, Case No. 10-CA-145378, which is reported at 362 NLRB No. 74, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A. Petitioner seeks review of the Board's Order and requests that the Order be overturned or set aside.


Dated this 23rd day of April, 2015.

RECEIVED
APR 23 2015
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Respectfully submitted,

Ivan H. Rich, Jr. Esq.
FedEx Freight, Inc.
1715 Aaron Brenner Drive
Suite 600
Memphis TN 38120-144
Tel: (901) 434-3520
ivan.richjr@fedex.com

Justin B. Cutlip, Esq.
JACKSON LEWIS P.C.
220 Headquarters Plaza
East Tower, 7th Floor
Morristown, New Jersey 07960
(973) 538-6890
cutlipj@jacksonlewis.com

By: 
Attorneys for FedEx Freight, Inc.



UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

FEDEX FREIGHT, INC.)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 vs.)
)
 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,)
)
 Respondent.)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 23rd day of April, 2015, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Petition for Review was served by certified, first-class United States mail, postage prepaid, upon the following:

Linda J. Dreeben, Esq.
Deputy Associate General Counsel
Appellate and Supreme Court Litigation Branch
Office of General Counsel
National Labor Relations Board
1099 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20570

Ashley L. Banks
Counsel for Acting General Counsel
ashley.banks@nlrb.gov
National Labor Relations Board
Region 10, Subregion 11
Republic Square, Suite 200
4035 University Parkway
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27106-2235

James F. Wallington, Esq.
Baptiste & Wilder, P.C.
jwallington@bapwild.com
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 315
Washington, DC 20036-4104

Mr. Claude T. Harrell
Regional Director
claud.harrell@nlrb.gov
National Labor Relations Board
Region 10, Subregion 11
Republic Square, Suite 200
4035 University Parkway
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27106-2235


Justin B. Cutlip

EXHIBIT A

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.

FedEx Freight, Inc. and International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 71. Case 10-CA-145378

April 20, 2015

DECISION AND ORDER

BY CHAIRMAN PEARCE AND MEMBERS HIROZAWA
AND JOHNSON

This is a refusal-to-bargain case in which the Respondent is contesting the Union's certification as bargaining representative in the underlying representation proceeding. Pursuant to a charge filed by International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 71 (the Union) on January 30, 2015, and amended on February 11, 2015, the General Counsel issued the complaint on February 13, 2015, alleging that FedEx Freight, Inc. (the Respondent) has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act by refusing the Union's request for recognition and to bargain following the Union's certification in Case 10-RC-136185. (Official notice is taken of the record in the representation proceeding as defined in the Board's Rules and Regulations, Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g). *Frontier Hotel*, 265 NLRB 343 (1982).) The Respondent filed an answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations of the complaint, and asserting certain affirmative defenses.

On March 6, 2015, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On March 10, 2015, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed a response, in which it requested that the Board clarify the record to include additional evidence. The Union filed a statement in support of the General Counsel's motion, and the General Counsel filed an opposition to the Respondent's request to clarify the record.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment

The Respondent admits its refusal to bargain but contests the validity of the Union's certification on the basis of its arguments, raised and rejected in the representation proceeding, that the certified bargaining unit is inappropriate because it excludes the Respondent's dockworkers.

All representation issues raised by the Respondent were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding. The Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege any special circumstances that would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding.¹ We therefore find that the Respondent has not raised any representation issue that is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941). Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. JURISDICTION

At all material times, the Respondent has been a corporation with an office and place of business in Charlotte, North Carolina, and has been engaged in the business of interstate and intrastate transportation of freight.

In conducting its operations annually, the Respondent derived gross revenues in excess of \$50,000 for the

¹ The Respondent requests that the Board "clarify" the record in the representation proceeding by admitting into evidence a report purportedly detailing the hours worked by city drivers, road drivers, and dockworkers at other "non-domiciled" locations for the time period of February 1, 2014, to July 31, 2014. This request, which we shall treat as a motion to reopen the representation proceeding record, is denied. The proffered information does not constitute newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence, nor would the evidence, if adduced, establish special circumstances.

A party seeking to introduce new evidence after the record of a representation proceeding has closed must establish that (1) the evidence existed but was unavailable to the party before the close of the hearing; (2) the evidence would have changed the result of the proceeding; and (3) it moved promptly upon discovery of the evidence. *Manhattan Center Studios*, 357 NLRB No. 139, slip op. at 3 (2011); Rules and Regulations, Sec. 102.65(e). To qualify as newly discovered evidence, such evidence must have been in existence at the time of the representation hearing and could not have been discovered by reasonable diligence. *Crew One Productions*, 362 NLRB No. 8, slip op. at 1, fn. 1 (2015); *Manhattan Center Studios*, 357 NLRB No. 139, slip op. at 3. The evidence the Respondent proffers is merely an expansion of the same class of information (i.e., dock work performed by the city drivers and road drivers during the period of February 1, 2014, to July 31, 2014) that the Respondent presented during the representation case proceeding. Here, the proffered evidence concerns facts that were in existence at the time of the representation hearing and it is offered in support of the same arguments by the Respondent that were fully litigated at the hearing and subsequently rejected. The Respondent has not submitted any reason why this additional evidence was unavailable during the course of the hearing or why it could not have been discovered with reasonable diligence. Further, the Respondent has failed to establish that the proffered evidence, if adduced, would change the result in the representation proceeding and has additionally failed to establish that it moved promptly to present this evidence.

transportation of freight from the State of North Carolina directly to points outside the State of North Carolina.

We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6), and (7) of the Act and that the Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. *The Certification*

Following a representation election held on November 19, 2014, the Union was certified on December 12, 2014, as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time Road Drivers and City Drivers employed by the Employer at its 4349 Scott Futrell Drive, Charlotte, North Carolina terminal; excluding all other employees, Dockworkers/Driver Apprentices, Supplemental Dockworkers, Mechanics, building maintenance and custodial employees, office clerical employees, and guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

The Union continues to be the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the unit employees under Section 9(a) of the Act.

B. *Refusal to Bargain*

By letter dated December 19, 2014, the Union requested that the Respondent bargain collectively with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the unit. Since about January 16, 2015, the Respondent has failed and refused to do so.

We find that this failure and refusal constitutes an unlawful failure and refusal to recognize and bargain with the Union in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

By failing and refusing since January 16, 2015, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the appropriate unit, the Respondent has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

REMEDY

Having found that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order it to cease and desist, to bargain on request with the Union and, if an understanding is reached, to embody the understanding in a signed agreement. To ensure that employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent

for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of the certification as beginning the date that the Respondent begins to bargain in good faith with the Union. *Mar-Jac Poultry Co.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); accord *Burnett Construction Co.*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), *enfd.* 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965); *Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), *enfd.* 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied* 379 U.S. 817 (1964).

ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, FedEx Freight, Inc., Charlotte, North Carolina, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Failing and refusing to recognize and bargain with International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 71 as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the bargaining unit.

(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) On request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement:

All full-time and regular part-time road drivers and city drivers employed by the Employer at its 4349 Scott Futrell Drive, Charlotte, North Carolina terminal; excluding all other employees, Dockworkers/Driver Apprentices, Supplemental Dockworkers, Mechanics, building maintenance and custodial employees, office clerical employees, and guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

(b) Within 14 days after service by the Region, post at its facility in Charlotte, North Carolina, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."² Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 10, 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. In addition to physical posting of

² 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."

paper notices, notices shall be distributed electronically, such as by email, posting on an intranet or an internet site, and/or other electronic means, if the Respondent customarily communicates with its employees by such means. 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 to all current employees and former employees employed by the Respondent at any time since January 16, 2015.

(c) Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director for Region 10 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.

Dated, Washington, D.C. April 20, 2015

Mark Gaston Pearce,	Chairman
Kent Y. Hirozawa,	Member
Harry I. Johnson, III,	Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

APPENDIX
NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
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.

FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

- 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.

WE WILL NOT fail and refuse to recognize and bargain with International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 71 as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights listed above.

WE WILL, on request, bargain with the Union and put in writing and sign any agreement reached on terms and conditions of employment for the following bargaining unit:

All full-time and regular part-time Road Drivers and City Drivers employed by us at our 4349 Scott Futrell Drive, Charlotte, North Carolina terminal; excluding all other employees, Dockworkers/Driver Apprentices, Supplemental Dockworkers, Mechanics, building maintenance and custodial employees, office clerical employees, and guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

FEDEX FREIGHT, INC.

The Board's decision can be found at www.nlr.gov/case/10-CA-145378 or by using the QR code below. Alternatively, you can obtain a copy of the decision from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570, or by calling (202) 273-1940.