

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

**GLOBAL CONTACT SERVICES,  
Respondent**

**and**

**Case 29-CA-211765 et al.**

**TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION,  
AFL-CIO LOCAL 100  
Charging Party**

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO FILE REPLY BRIEF**

This case was heard before me on two days, September 17 and October 17, 2018 in Brooklyn, at which all parties were afforded the opportunity to present their evidence. At the close of trial, I set a due date of Wednesday, November 21, 2018 for receipt of post-hearing briefs.

Thereafter, the General Counsel requested an extension of time to file briefs which was consented to by all parties. That request was granted, and the due date was extended to Wednesday, December 19, 2018. Subsequently, Respondent requested an extension of time to file briefs, also consented to by all parties. That request was also granted, and the due date was extended to Wednesday, January 9, 2019. On that date, the General Counsel and Respondent filed timely briefs.

Respondent now moves to file an additional post-hearing reply brief in order to address what it labels "inaccurate statements of law and fact contained in General Counsel's post-hearing brief" and to respond to certain legal assertions contained in General Counsel's brief.

I am denying the Respondent's Request. There is no provision in the Board's Rules for the filing of post-hearing reply or answering briefs. Rather, it is in the discretion of the trial judge to ask for them or grant a motion for leave to file them in an appropriate case.

Here, I have the benefit of a complete record for this 2-day trial, along with the parties' post-trial briefs, which address all the issues before me. I find no need for additional submissions. Accordingly, Respondent's Motion is denied.

Dated: January 28, 2019



---

Jeffrey P. Gardner  
Administrative Law Judge