A couple of recent NLRB decisions address the issue of employer discipline where there are no specific rules or precedents addressing the misconduct. In *Sam’s Club, A Division of Wal-Mart*, 342 NLRB No. 57 (2004), an employee was issued a “final warning” for secretly bringing a tape recorder to work to make surreptitious recordings of conversations, including a conversation with the company’s director of operations. Just a few days before, a manager had unlawfully interrogated the employee about a wage petition that he was circulating. Under the circumstances, strong discipline issued to an otherwise exemplary employee only days after learning that he had circulated a wage petition, might have been considered normal and lawful had the company produced a rule or policy prohibiting taping or similar conduct, according to the NLRB majority, in finding the discipline to be unlawfully motivated. In dissent, NLRB Chairman Battista criticized the majority, stating that the analysis would result in a violation in any situation where the misconduct in question had not previously occurred. The Chairman stated that there may be instances where no employee has previously engaged in the conduct involved, or in analogous conduct, and the law does not immunize the conduct from discipline in these situations. He also argued that the fact that the company had no rule or policy about surreptitious taping does not immunize the conduct from discipline. In responding to Chairman Battista’s comments, the NLRB majority states that contrary to the dissent’s suggestion, it is not holding that an employer may never impose discipline for misconduct that was unprecedented or not specifically addressed by the employer’s prior rules or policies. The majority states that their point is that the absence of such evidence is telling under the circumstances of this case, given the employee’s exemplary record and the evidence of the company’s unlawful motive.

Another recent NLRB ruling dealt with a similar issue. *Davey Roofing, Inc.*, 341 NLRB No. 27 (2004). Here, the NLRB majority found that the company did not violate the law when it discharged two employees for refusing to sign warnings for safety violations at the work site. The employer contended that the refusal of the employees to sign the warnings constituted insubordination and disregard for work site safety. The employer argued that it would have discharged the employees for such insubordination even in the absence of any union activity. The evidence showed that during the day in question the company issued twelve warnings and that the two employees were the only employees who refused to sign. Prior to the incident in question, no employee had ever refused to sign a safety warning. In the Davey Roofing case, the Board majority found that there were no similarly situated employees against which to compare the company’s treatment of the two employees in question.

Dissenting Board Member Walsh, however, found that the reasons for discharging the two employees were not worthy of belief, and that instead the company had seized upon the refusals as a pretext for retaliating against the two employees’ union activity. The dissent further relied on certain evidence showing that the company had merely suspended other employees for serious acts of misconduct, while it discharged these two employees for refusing to sign a warning. The dissent further noted that the company’s safety policies and procedure manual does not contain a requirement that employees sign safety warnings, or mention any punishment for failure to sign the warnings. The dissent contended that the absence of such provisions belied the company’s assertion that signing the safety violation warnings was of such importance that failure to sign the warnings warrants immediate discharge.
is often that the employer failed to follow its prior rules or policies, or past practices, warranting an inference of discrimination. Therefore, the employer’s “first line of defense” is that an employee violated a written rule or policy, and/or past practice in the way certain situations are handled. In these two NLRB cases, there were no written rules or policies, and no past instances of the conduct in question. Therefore, the NLRB struggled with the issues of whether discrimination had occurred under the circumstances.

SHRM SURVEYS EMPLOYER MEDICAL LEAVE AND FMLA POLICIES

A survey of 416 human resource professionals by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) finds that the primary challenge for employers under the FMLA is discerning what constitutes a serious health condition where FMLA would be legitimately used, and tracking the amount of time used during intermittent leave. Other key findings include:

• 63% make exceptions to FMLA to provide more flexibility for employees.

• 57% offer job-protected leave beyond FMLA requirements, including leave for employees that have been employed for less than twelve months.

• 62% most often assign the work of employees on leave to other employees, while just 15% most often hire temporary employees.

• Less than half (48%) of leave requests were scheduled in advance.

• 50% of human resource professionals said they had approved leave requests they believed were not legitimate, but had to be granted due to Department Of Labor interpretations of the law.

In at least one favorable judicial development, however, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta has ruled that working partial days may not qualify an employee for FMLA leave. Russell v. North Broward Hospital, 149 F.3d 34, 760 (C.A. 11, 2003). The employee was not entitled to FMLA protection for the time off, according to the court, because she did not have a serious health condition with more than three days of incapacity, according to §825.114 of the federal regulations. The plaintiff argued that partial days of incapacity should count, but the appeals court did not agree. It said she had to be incapacitated for more than three full days, adopting the common midnight-to-midnight definition of “day,” in order to have a qualified serious health condition. Holding that full days are required insures that conditions will be serious, according to the court. It also provides a bright-line rule defining the period of incapacity.

COURTS SUPPORT WORKPLACE DRUG TESTING PROGRAMS

Court cases are in support of workplace drug testing, according to a March 25 report issued by the Washington, D.C. based Institute for a Drug-Free Workplace. More than 85% of the court decisions have been pro-drug testing, according to the report. As long as employers follow proper procedures, according to the report, “drug testing of employees and job applicants is not particularly vulnerable to legal challenge in America today.”

The main challenge to private employers’ drug testing policies has been under specific state statutes or under general privacy principles. Simply failing to follow proper laboratory testing procedures as set forth by law can cause legal problems. Also, employers that have a reasonable suspicion of an employee’s drug or alcohol use must proceed with caution, especially with employees whose jobs are not safety related, particularly in those states that have broad individual privacy protections in their state constitutions or rulings. Applying fitness-for-duty tests also poses some difficulty, in that the employer must substantiate that the employee is incapable of working safely due to the level of intoxication. Overly explicit company policy statements can also prove hazardous if the employer does not update them or fails to notify employees of the new policies.

The six types of drug testing covered in the report are pre-employment,
This August was the tenth anniversary of the enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). A survey funded by the U.S. Labor Department finds that more than half of people who take leave under the Act do so to take care of their own serious illness, and about 18% do so to take care of a newborn child. About 13% take time for a seriously ill parent, and about 12% take the time for a seriously ill child. Another 6% take FMLA time to care for a seriously ill spouse, according to the survey.

Both employer and employee advocacy groups say that the law should be modified and expanded, but disagree on what that should entail. A spokes-woman for the National Partnership for Women and Families, says that the FMLA is now so commonly seen as a plus for attracting and retaining good workers that about a third of businesses not covered by the law now offer the benefit even though they are not required to do so. Employer groups have found problems with the intermittent leave. Employees who are certified for intermittent leave under FMLA can readily call in at the last minute and get off. This provision also allows employees to take leaves in the smallest increments that a payroll system allows, so that if an employer can calculate payroll time in six-minute increments, an employee can take time off as little as six minutes off at a time. Employers would also like to see the law allow for employers to verify with certifying physicians that an employee’s use of leave time is used appropriately. Legislation has been introduced in Congress to address both sides of these issues.

A survey funded by the U.S. Labor Department finds that more than half of people who take leave under the Act do so to take care of their own serious illness, and about 18% do so to take care of a newborn child. About 13% take time for a seriously ill parent, and about 12% take the time for a seriously ill child. Another 6% take FMLA time to care for a seriously ill spouse, according to the survey.
existing bargaining units. Although the current ruling will help employers avoid unions among their temporary agency workers, employers must still keep in mind that such agency employees are often considered jointly employed by the user employer, and thus the user employer may still be subject to discrimination charges and the like, brought by temporary agency employees.

Thus, employers should not assume that they are immune from legal liability resulting from the use of temporary agency employees. Sometimes arrangements can be made with the temporary agency to provide for indemnity to the user employer in such situations, however.

These type issues are sometimes covered in the user contract between the employer and the temporary agency.

Between 2002 and 2003, the median plaintiffs’ verdict increased from $230,000 to $250,000 for federal cases in which there was a verdict for the plaintiff in employment practice litigation, according to Jury Verdict Research. The award mean was even higher in 2003, at $595,718. The largest plaintiffs’ verdict was $4 million. In federal district court cases where plaintiffs received compensation, 25% contained allegations of sexual harassment and 18% contained allegations of a hostile work environment.

In general, of plaintiff verdicts, the median award is considered the more accurate gauge of the norm for a sampling of jury award data.

**AVERAGE PLAINTIFFS’ VERDICT INCREASES**

**HEAD NOD EXPRESSIONS AS ADMISSION OF GUILT**

Over the years several cases have arisen as to whether an employer’s silence, or expression, can be deemed an admission of guilt. In a recent case, the plaintiff claimed that he was being terminated because he was “too old” and testified that the employer’s president nodded in response. The plaintiff contended that this head nodding constituted an admission of guilt even though the company president did not say anything. The court concluded that under the proper circumstances, a nod of the head can qualify as an affirmative admission, and used against an employer to prove a case of discrimination. McDevitt v. Bill Good Builders, 91 FEP Cases 595 (2003). The court even cited an earlier ruling that in some circumstances, a smile in response to an accusation has been found to be “tantamount to an admission” under certain circumstances.

**Editor’s Note** - Managers and supervisors need to be aware that if a claim of discrimination or illegal acts are made against their employer, they should not indicate agreement but should deny or doubt the accusation. There have even been some reports that some employees have hidden tape recorders in an effort to illicit some type of admission from management.

Managers and supervisors need to be aware that if a claim of discrimination or illegal acts are made against their employer, they should not indicate agreement but should deny or doubt the accusation. There have even been some reports that some employees have hidden tape recorders in an effort to illicit some type of admission from management.

**GRAFFITI MUST BE QUICKLY Addressed**

Racial, sexual, or degrading graffiti are showing up in an increasing number of cases. Because of the public nature of graffiti, courts are increasingly mandating that it be removed quickly, in order to avoid the creation of a “hostile environment.” A recent example of an appropriate employer response is suggested in the case of Scarberry v. Exxon Mobil Oil Corp., 91 FEP Cases T320 (C.A. 10, 2003).

This case centered on Exxon Mobil’s responses to incidents of sexually degrading graffiti referring to the plaintiff and another female employee. Someone had spray-painted the plaintiff’s name on the walls of the plant during the night, and on a large spool used as a table in a break area. The plaintiff claimed that because the human resources manager did not come to work on his day off to personally view the table, and because the investigation of the graffiti incident spanned three months before the suspected perpetrator was fired, the jury could conclude that the employer’s investigation was not prompt or adequate.

The court disagreed, and found the employer had promptly and adequately responded. The court found that after his day off, the human resource manager took the following actions: (1) personally viewed the graffiti; (2) took pictures of the graffiti so that he could investigate the handwriting; (3) authorized the graffiti’s immediate removal; (4) began interviewing employees and security guards to determine who might be responsible; (5) began interviewing employees who had been targeted as suspects; (6) during the following weeks, the manager collected numerous writing samples from the suspected employee’s records and compared them with the graffiti; (7) reviewed the plant’s security system surveillance tapes; (8) reviewed trucking logs of outside contractors who were on the premises during the relevant period; (9) attempted to identify a forensic handwriting expert; (10)
contacted headquarters seeking additional assistance; and (11) alerted security to be more aware of the potential problems at the plant.

**Editor’s Note** - Employers must be particularly wary of graffiti and racial or sexual symbols. A number of recent cases, for example, have also addressed the issue of nooses hanging in plants or maintenance shops even for a brief period of time. Such facts patterns often generate litigation and even though employers often win these cases, the lesson to be learned is to take action very thoroughly and quickly.

Employers have long been concerned about reductions in force which adversely or disproportionately affect protected groups such as minorities and females. Employers are sensitive that such layoffs resulting in adverse impact to protected groups often result in discrimination claims, often brought by more than one individual or possibly even a class action. For these reasons, employers sometimes run projected layoff figures and then look at the statistics and then determine if adjustments are necessary to avoid discrimination claims. In these circumstances, it can be said that an employer is running risks whatever it does.

First, technically it is the employer who is potentially discriminating because of demographic makeup, and the extent to which the demographic makeup, and the extent to which the statistical results, employers can still use to determine whether the decision-makers are diverse enough to have made the decision without discrimination. Advice of counsel is necessary to determine whether there is adverse impact. Advice of counsel is definitely necessary in such matters, as old rules of thumb such as the 80% rule can be very misleading. Under the old 80% rule, if the majority is selected for layoff at a rate of at least 80% in their appropriate pool as protected groups there is no adverse impact. Such simplistic rules of thumb may be misleading, however, particularly in larger samples, and advice of counsel is necessary to evaluate statistical results.

In RIFs, many employers also consider other protective measures, such as offering voluntary termination plans and/or severance packages in exchange for a release of claims.
The Republican party’s resounding victory on November 2 should support pro-business employment policies over the next four years. Republicans added to their majority in both the Senate and the House, adding four Senate seats to 55, and at least 3 House seats, giving them 232 seats to the Democrats’ 202. However, 60 votes are still needed to block a filibuster in the Senate, and thus the Democrats will still retain a form of veto in that chamber.

In addition to the President’s base of conservative Christians, the President expanded his vote among Jews (24% from 19%), Hispanics (43% from 35%) and Catholics (51% from 47%). Among African-Americans, the President was able to use his conservative position on social issues to increase his vote share to 11% from 8% four years ago, and an even larger 15% in the decisive state of Ohio. People who identified themselves as Republicans and Democrats each made up 37% of the electorate. Self-identified conservatives made up 34% of the electorate, up from 29% in 2000, compared to the 21% proportion of self-identified liberals.

Contrary to the popular perception, the largest turnout in history, some 120 million, did not hurt and may have actually aided the Democrats. President Bush’s victory will significantly affect federal regulatory policies, including those in employment. The Bush Administration is likely to continue to push to loosen labor rules and regulations, and to avoid or at least delay many employment issues championed by Democrats. The latter group includes raising the federal $5.15 minimum wage to $7.00 per hour, expanding coverage of the Family and Medical Leave Act to include small business, and overturning the new overtime regulations. The second Bush Administration will also bring about major changes in retirement and health insurance. The President’s emphasis on individual responsibility may lead him to start to shift away from a health care system that most Americans get their insurance through work, to one in which individuals are more responsible for financing their health care through a system of tax credits and health-savings accounts. Recent initiatives indicate that sharing more costs with employees is succeeding, as workers who have to spend more out of pocket are more careful in their use of healthcare services. The President has also championed new types of investment vehicles to build up retirement savings, including an extension of the concept to the Social Security system. The President has proposed that individuals be allowed to direct some of the taxes that they pay on their behalf into personal retirement accounts, while the rest of the Social Security taxes would continue to go towards covering traditional benefits.
Congratulations and Thanks for a Job Well Done!

The Firm is proud to announce that as of January 1, 2005 Phil Lawson, the founding member of the Tennessee Operations of Wimberly Lawson Seale Wright & Daves, is beginning his well-earned retirement from the active practice of law. He will continue developing his arbitration, mediation, and leadership training efforts.

Under Phil’s leadership the Tennessee operations of Wimberly Lawson Seale Wright & Daves grew from his solo practice in Morristown, Tennessee to a practice located in Morristown, Knoxville, Cookeville and Nashville, employing nearly thirty attorneys. Phil and his lovely wife, Neville, gave unselfishly to the Firm and warmly touched our lives. He made a difference.

All of us congratulate Phil upon his retirement and thank him for a job well done. His spirit and inspiration will continue to guide the Firm for many years. Thanks Phil!


Keep your workplace knowledge up-to-date with this excellent guide to the “hot legal topics” you are expected to know as an executive, general counsel or human resource administrator. This hardbound desk reference of over 500 pages and is written in “everyday” language.

This manual is the companion material provided to attendees at our 2004 Labor Relations & Employment Law Update Conference held in Nashville and Knoxville. It is now offered to you on a LIMITED QUANTITY basis - only a few volumes remaining. The cost is $60 plus shipping for each manual. To order please email Brenda Hopper at bhopper@wlswd.com or call 865.546.1000.
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www.wlswd.com
for all the latest information regarding our seminars