

BEFORE
THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

FRED MEYER STORES, INC Employer and UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS, LOCAL 367 Charging Party	Case No. 19-CA-32311 CHARGING PARTY OPPOSITION TO EMPLOYER REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
---	--

INTRODUCTION

The Employer on October 21, 2010 filed a motion to reconsider the Board's decision in *Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.* 355 NLRB No. 130 (8/26/2010). The Charging Party opposes the motion to reconsider on grounds that the motion is not timely, and even if considered timely, is not supported.

I. THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER MUST BE FILED WITHIN 28 DAYS OF SERVICE OF THE DECISION; THE MOTION, FILED APPROXIMATELY 55 DAYS LATER IS UNTIMELY.

NLRB Rule and Regulation 102.48 under which the motion was filed dictates that such motions be filed within 28 days of service of the decision. R&R 102.48(d)(2). The Employer's motion to reconsider was filed well beyond 28 days and should be denied on this basis alone.

II. THERE IS NO SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSITION THAT *NEW PROCESS STEEL* REQUIRED CONSIDERATION ON REMAND BY DIFFERENT BOARD MEMBERS.

The Employer asserts with no support, other than bluster, that the Board on remand was obligated by *New Process Steel* to proceed with different Board members as opposed to a sufficient number of Board members. The Court in *New Process Steel*, 130 S. Ct. 2635, stated only that the case should be remanded for proceeding consistent with its opinion. Its opinion discussed the number of Board members necessary for it to function, but notably failed to dictate that cases decided by two Board members must on remand be decided by a sufficient number of different Board members. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Laurel Bay Healthcare of Lake Lanier, Inc. v. NLRB*, in remanding stated that the underlying Board decision “be vacated, and the case remanded for further proceedings before the Board at such time as it may once again consist of sufficient members to constitute a quorum.” 564 F.3d at 476 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (emphasis added). The Board properly considered the case on remand by a Board quorum. There is no basis to reconsider its August 26 decision.

III. IN ITS AUGUST 26 DECISION THE BOARD PROPERLY DETERMINED THAT THE EMPLOYER ADMITTED IT HAD REFUSED TO BARGAIN MAKING ADDITIONAL BOARD PROCESS UNNECESSARY AND BURDENSOME.

The Employer suggests in its motion that it had not conceded that it refused to bargain to test the certification. Motion at 3-4. Yet it admitted that it had refused to bargain in its answer to the complaint in this matter. *Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.* 355 NLRB No. 130 n. 4 (8/26/2010). Notably the Employer is not seeking reconsideration to assert that it has been or is now willing to bargain as the Board had suggested. It hasn’t.

CONCLUSION

There is no basis to grant the untimely motion to reconsider. It should be denied.

Respectfully submitted this 29th day of October, 2010.

s/Carson Glickman-Flora

Lawrence Schwerin, WSBA # 4360

Carson Glickman-Flora, WSBA #37608

Schwerin Campbell Barnard Iglitzin & Lavitt LLP

18 West Mercer Street, Ste. 400

Seattle, WA 98119-3971

(206) 285-2828 (phone)

(206) 378-4132 (fax)

schwerin@workerlaw.com

flora@workerlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 29th day of October 2010, I caused Charging Party's
Opposition to Employer Request for Reconsideration to be filed electronically with:

Lester Heltzer
Office of the Executive Secretary
National Labor Relations Board
1099 14th Street NW, Suite 11600
Washington DC 20570

Richard Ahearn
Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board, Region 19
2948 Jackson Federal Building
915 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98174

And a copy to be sent via email to:

Richard J. Alli Jr.
Bullard, Smith, Jernstedt & Wilson
1000 SW Broadway, Suite 1900
Portland, OR 97205
RAlli@bullardlaw.com

s/Carson Glickman-Flora
Carson Glickman-Flora