

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

FRED MEYER STORES, INC.

and

Case 19-CA-31994

UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL
WORKERS LOCAL 1439 affiliated with
UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL
WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION

**REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE
WHY SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED**

On September 2, 2009, Respondent filed its Response to the Board's August 19, 2009, Notice to Show Cause why Counsel for the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment (the "Motion") should not be granted. In its Response, Respondent essentially asserts that, because there was an improper delegation of authority to the remaining Board members, as found in *Laurel Baye Healthcare of Lake Lanier, Inc.*, 564 F.3d 469 (D.C. Cir. 2009), there remains a question concerning representation to be resolved by a full complement of the Board that must precede any decision on the merits of the alleged unfair labor practices. This, it contends, is the reason why summary judgment is inappropriate. Respondent is mistaken.

As the Board has recently re-affirmed in *Chenega Integrated Systems*, 354 NLRB No. 56, fn 1 (July 29, 2009):

Effective midnight December 28, 2007, Members Liebman, Schaumber, Kirsanow, and Walsh delegated to Members Liebman, Schaumber, and Kirsanow, as a three-member group, all of the Board's powers in anticipation of the expiration of the terms of

Members Kirsanow and Walsh on December 31, 2007. Pursuant to this delegation, Chairman Liebman and Member Schaumber constitute a quorum of the three-member group. As a quorum, they have the authority to issue decisions and orders in unfair labor practice and representation cases. See Sec. 3(b) of the Act. See *Snell Island SNF LLC v. NLRB*, 568 F.3d 410 (2d Cir. 2009); *New Process Steel v. NLRB*, 564 F.3d 840 (7th Cir. 2009), *petition for cert. filed* 77 U.S.L.W. 3670 (U.S. May 22, 2009) (No. 08-1457); *Northeastern Land Services v. NLRB*, 560 F.3d 36 (1st Cir. 2009), *rehearing denied* No. 08-1878 (May 20, 2009). But see *Laurel Baye Healthcare of Lake Lanier, Inc. v. NLRB*, 564 F.3d 469 (D.C. Cir. 2009), *petitions for rehearing denied* Nos. 08-1162, 08-1214 (July 1, 2009).

Thus, the Board clearly was acting within its statutory authority on April 21, 2009, when it issued its Order denying Respondent's Request for Review, finding that it raised no substantial issues warranting review. A copy of the Order is attached as Exhibit E to the Motion.


As set forth in the Motion, the Regional Director's Certification of Representative issued subsequent to the Board's Order denying Respondent's Request for Review, thus established the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of Respondent's Francis Store nutrition employees. Accordingly, there remained no material issues of disputed fact regarding the Union's status as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of these employees or of Respondent's obligation to recognize and bargain with the Union. *Concrete Form Walls, Inc.*, 347 NLRB 1299 (2006).

Where, as here, a party refuses to meet and bargain following certification by the Board, it is not the policy of the Board to allow that party to relitigate in an unfair labor practice proceeding those issues which that party has already litigated and that the Board decided in a prior representation proceeding, absent newly discovered, relevant evidence

not available at the time of the litigation in the prior representation proceeding. *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941); *Washington Beef, Inc.*, 322 NLRB 398 (1996); § 102.67(f) of the Board's Rules and Regulations. Respondent has not asserted, nor can it assert, the existence of any newly discovered relevant evidence on these issues. As such, summary judgment is appropriate.

Since the Board acted appropriately in deciding the representation case issue, the unfair labor practices are properly before it in the instant case as a matter ripe for disposition on summary judgment. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Board grant the Motion for Summary Judgment and make findings of fact and conclusions of law that Respondent's conduct violated §§ 8(a)(1) and (5) of the Act as alleged in the Complaint.

DATED at Seattle, Washington, this 9th day of September, 2009.



Anne P. Pomerantz
Counsel for the General Counsel
National Labor Relations Board, Region 19
2948 Jackson Federal Building
915 Second Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98174

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 9th day of September, 2009, I caused copies of Reply to Respondent's Response to Notice to Show Cause Why Summary Judgment Should Not Be Granted to be served upon each the following via E-File, E-Mail, and/or Telephone and Facsimile:

E-File: Lester A. Heltzer, Executive Secretary
National Labor Relations Board
1099 – 14th Street, N.W., Room 11602
Washington, D.C. 20570


E-Mail: Richard J. Alli, Jr., Attorney
BULLARD SMITH JERNSTEDT WILSON
1000 SW Broadway, Suite 1900
Portland, OR 97205-3071
Phone: (503) 228-1134
Facsimile: (503) 224-8851
ralli@bullardlaw.com

Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.
Attn: Cynthia Thornton, Vice President
Employee Relations
3800 SE 22nd Ave.
Portland, OR 97202-2999
Phone: (509) 797-7905
Facsimile: (503) 797-7770
Cynthia.thornton@fredmeyer.com

UFCW Local 1439
Attn: Brittany Pitcher, Grievance Officer
1719 N. Atlantic St.
Spokane, WA 99205-4804
Phone: (509) 328-6090 Ext. 214
Facsimile: (509) 326-2208
Brittany@ufcw1439.org

Telephone & Facsimile:

Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.
Attn: Carl Wojciechowski
3800 SE 22nd Ave.
Portland, OR 97202-2999
Phone: (503) 797-7781
Facsimile: (503) 797-7772



Kathlyn L. Mills, Secretary