



United States Government

**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
1015 HALF STREET SE  
WASHINGTON, DC 20570**

August 27, 2020

David A. Rosenfeld, Attorney  
Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld  
1001 Marina Village Pkwy Suite 200  
Alameda, CA 94501-6430  
Phone: (510) 337-1001  
Fax: (510) 337-1023  
[drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net](mailto:drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net)

Angela Hollowell-Fuentes  
Counsel for the General Counsel  
National Labor Relations Board, Region 32  
1301 Clay Street, Suite 300N  
Oakland, CA 94612-5224  
[angela.hollowellfuentes@nlrb.gov](mailto:angela.hollowellfuentes@nlrb.gov)

Emily M. Maglio, Attorney  
Lindsay R. Nicholas, Attorney  
Leonard Carder LLP  
1188 Franklin St Ste 201  
San Francisco, CA 94109-6800  
Phone: (415) 771-6400  
Fax: (415) 771-7010  
[emaglio@leonardcarder.com](mailto:emaglio@leonardcarder.com)  
[lnicholas@leonardcarder.com](mailto:lnicholas@leonardcarder.com)

Re: International Longshore & Warehouse Union (Pacific Crane Maintenance Company, Inc.), Case 32-CB-005932

Dear Counsels,

This letter is in regard to the filings related to the parties' exceptions and cross-exceptions to the Administrative Law Judge's decision in the subject case. The ALJ decision issued on July 9, 2020, and as such, exceptions to that decision were due to be filed with the Board on or before August 6, 2020. The Charging Parties filed timely exceptions on July 22, 2020. The Respondent filed exceptions on August 7, 2020, one day after the due date. On August 10, the Charging Parties filed a motion to strike Respondent's exceptions as untimely, and Counsel for the General Counsel filed a joinder to the motion to strike. On August 11, the Respondent filed an opposition to the motion and joinder, arguing that it was served with the ALJ decision late, on July 10, and therefore its exceptions were timely. On August 12, the General Counsel filed a reply to the Respondent's opposition. The same day, the Respondent filed a sur-reply in response to the General Counsel's reply to the Respondent's opposition to the motion to strike its exceptions. On August 13, this office denied the Charging Parties' motion to strike the Respondent's exceptions and stated that the Respondent's sur-reply would not be accepted. On the same date, this office extended the time to file answering briefs to exceptions until September 4. On August 17, the Charging Parties' filed a

motion for reconsideration of this office's denial of their motion to strike and the Respondent filed an opposition.

In addition, on August 17, the Respondent filed cross-exceptions and a brief in support. On August 21, the Charging Parties filed a motion to strike Respondent's cross-exceptions, contending that the Respondent may not file both exceptions and cross-exceptions. On the same date, the Respondent filed an opposition to the motion to strike its cross-exceptions. On August 24, this office extended the time to file answering briefs to cross-exceptions until September 14.

As rulings have not yet issued on the Charging Parties' motion for reconsideration of the denial of the motion to strike the Respondent's exceptions and the Charging Parties' motion to strike the Respondent's cross-exceptions, **the time for filing answering briefs to the Respondent's exceptions and cross-exceptions will not commence until the Board rules on the motion for reconsideration pertaining to Respondent's exceptions and the motion to strike Respondent's cross-exceptions.** However, as there is no dispute regarding the timeliness of the Charging Parties' exceptions, **the time for filing answering briefs to the Charging Parties' exceptions remains September 4, 2020.**

Very truly yours,

/s/ Farah Z. Qureshi  
Deputy Executive Secretary

cc: Parties