

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 10**

WESTROCK SERVICES, INC.)	
)	
and)	
)	Case 10-CA-195617
GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS)	
CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL)	
BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,)	
LOCAL 197-M)	

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Thomas Scroggins, on behalf of Joe Pike, respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for leave to intervene in this proceeding to protect Mr. Pike’s interest in a union decertification proceeding of the National Labor Relations Board in Case No. 10-RD-195447. In further support of his motion movant states as follows:

1. On March 24, 2017, Joe Pike petitioned for decertification of the above styled union.
2. On October 27, 2017, the Board issued an order denying a request to review the dismissal of Mr. Pike’s petition. The order, attached hereto as Exhibit A, states in pertinent part, “Further, consistent with the blocking charge policy, the petition is subject to reinstatement, if appropriate, upon final disposition of the unfair labor practice proceedings[.]” (Exhibit A, n. 1).
3. Mr. Pike’s petition was denied based on the potential existence of unfair labor practices.
4. When the Board decides this proceeding, Joe Pike interest in the petition for decertification will be directly affected.
5. Intervention will enable movant to preserve his rights to seek review of any decision contrary to his interests.

Respectfully submitted this 29th day of January, 2018.

/s/ Thomas W. Scroggins

Thomas W. Scroggins

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

JOE PIKE

OF COUNSEL:

ROSEN HARWOOD

P.O. Box 2727

Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35403

Telephone: (205) 344-5000

Facsimile: (205) 758-8358

E-mail: tscroggins@rosenharwood.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was filed via Electronic Filing, a copy has also been served via e-mail and/or U.S. Mail on the following, on this the 29th day of January, 2018:

Judge Robert A. Ringler
Division of Judges - Washington, D.C. Office
1015 Half Street SE
Washington, DC 20570-0001
(Via e-mail)

John D. Doyle, Jr.
Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board
Region 10
233 Peachtree Street, NE
Harris Tower - Suite 1000
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1504
(Via e-mail)

John J. Coleman, III, Attorney
Marcel L. Debruge, Attorney
Frank McRight, Attorney
Counsel for Employer WestRock Services, Inc.
Burr & Forman, LLP
420 North 20th Street, Suite 3400
Birmingham, AL 35203
(Via e-mail)

Kami Kimber, Attorney
Matthew J. Turner, Attorney
Counsel for the General Counsel
National Labor Relations Board
Region 10
233 Peachtree Street, NE
Harris Tower - Suite 1000
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1504
(Via e-mail)

Peter J. Leff, Attorney
Mooney, Green, Saindon, Murphy & Welch, P.C.
1920 L Street NW; Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5041
(Via e-mail and U.S. Mail)

Graphic Communications Conference of the
International Brotherhood of Teamsters,

Local 197-M
3922 Volunteer Drive; Suite 12
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37416-3901
(Via U.S. Mail)

s/ Thomas W. Scroggins
OF COUNSEL

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

WESTROCK SERVICES, INC.
Employer

and

JOE PIKE
Petitioner

Case 10-RD-195447

and

GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE,
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 197-M
Union

ORDER

The Employer and Petitioner's joint Request for Review of the Acting Regional Director's administrative dismissal of the petition is denied as it raises no substantial issues warranting review.¹

LAUREN McFERRAN, MEMBER

MARVIN E. KAPLAN, MEMBER

WILLIAM J. EMANUEL, MEMBER

¹ In denying review, we find that the Acting Regional Director's dismissal of the petition was fully consistent with the Board's blocking charge policy, insofar as the unfair labor practice charge at issue alleges conduct that, if proven, may invalidate the petition or some or all of the showing of interest submitted in support of the petition. See NLRB Casehandling Manual Part Two, Secs. 11730.3(a) and 11733.2(a)(1). Shortly after the petition was dismissed, the Acting Regional Director found merit to the charge at issue here and issued a complaint in Case 10-CA-195617, which is currently scheduled for a hearing before an administrative law judge. Although the Acting Regional Director's letter dismissing the petition contains language suggesting that the conduct alleged in the charges had already been proven, we find that this was an inadvertent error. Further, consistent with the blocking charge policy, the petition is subject to reinstatement, if appropriate, upon final disposition of the unfair labor practice proceedings, and the Petitioner is made a party in interest to Case 10-CA-195617 solely for the purpose of receiving notification of the final outcome of that case. See generally NLRB Casehandling Manual Part Two, Sec. 11733.2(b).

Member Kaplan agrees with the decision to deny review here. He notes, however, that he would consider revisiting the Board's blocking charge policy in a future appropriate case. Member Emanuel agrees that the dismissal of the petition in this case was permissible under the Board's current blocking charge policy, but he believes that the policy should be changed. Specifically, he believes that an employee's petition for an election should generally not be dismissed based on contested and unproven allegations of unfair labor practices.

Dated, Washington, D.C., October 27, 2017.