



Foundation Action

The bi-monthly newsletter
of the National Right to Work
Legal Defense Foundation, Inc.

Vol. XLV, No. 3

8001 Braddock Road • Springfield, Virginia 22160

www.nrtw.org

May/June 2025

Workers Nationwide Urge Trump NLRB to End Policies Trapping Them Under Union Power

NLRB-invented policies currently allow union bosses to block worker-requested votes

WASHINGTON, DC – During the Biden Administration, biased, pro-Big Labor National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) bureaucrats went out of their way to undermine the idea that workers and workers alone should choose whether or not they want a union. Rolling back multiple National Right to Work Foundation-backed reforms that made it easier for workers to vote out unions they didn't want was a prime example of this.

But the Biden NLRB's extremism is only the latest example of how federal labor law is biased against workers opposed to union affiliation. The truth is that biased bureaucrats on the NLRB have, for decades, burdened independent-minded workers with arbitrary barriers to freeing themselves from union influence. Many of these policies -- which are the inventions of NLRB decisions and appear nowhere in the National Labor Relations Act's (NLRA) text -- let union bosses block workers from exercising their statutory right to vote to remove a union.

Bus Drivers Fight Forced Dues in Huge, Inescapable Teamsters Unit

The Trump Administration taking control of the NLRB in Washington, D.C., has presented workers around the country who want to escape union influence with a new opportunity to attack these restrictions. Foundation attorneys are already helping workers lead the charge for reform to create



Theresa Hause, an Oregon-based school bus driver, wants the Trump NLRB to end the so-called "merger doctrine" that grants union officials the power to combine workplaces into giant, inescapable mega-units.

precedents that will allow others to remove unions opposed by most workers.

Last December, Theresa Hause, a Washington State-based school bus driver, submitted to the NLRB a deauthorization petition which contained employee support well over the necessary threshold needed to trigger a vote to strip Teamsters Local 58 bosses of their forced-dues power in Hause's workplace. Hause and her fellow drivers are employed by First Student, Inc.

She was surprised to learn during NLRB proceedings that First Student management and Teamsters union officials had covertly signed an agreement "merging" Hause's small unit of workers into a much larger national unit, composed of thousands of Teamsters-controlled bus drivers across the country.

Because of the NLRB's so-called "merger doctrine" policy, Hause

and her colleagues are now in this "mega-unit," and any petition to end the union's forced-dues power (or remove the union completely) needs to contain signatures from at least 30% of the "mega-unit" -- thousands of people Hause has never met -- to be considered valid. The NLRB official that dismissed Hause's petition even ruled that the fact employees were kept in the dark about this merger was irrelevant, outrageously saying "there is nothing in the merger doctrine that requires acquiescence or even notification of employees of a change in a bargaining unit."

Hause's Foundation-provided attorneys are challenging the merger doctrine in an appeal of Hause's case to the NLRB in D.C., arguing among other things that the policy violates employee free choice and that it serves as a protection racket

See *'Foundation Counters'* page 7

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Cincinnati-Area Kroger Worker Secures Victory Against Illegal Union Dues Deductions
- 3 AT&T-BellSouth Workers Challenge Union-Concocted 'Window Period' Restrictions on Ending Dues
- 4 Foundation Op-Ed in *The Washington Times*: Trump Was Right to Tell Biden Labor Board Appointee "You're Fired!"
- 5 NY Healthcare Worker Asks Labor Board to Unblock Vote to Oust SEIU
- 6 Foundation-Backed Baristas Support Trump's Firing of Biden NLRB Member

Cincinnati-Area Kroger Worker Secures Victory Against Illegal Union Dues Deductions

After legal win, grocery employee finds job in nearby Right to Work Kentucky to escape forced dues

CINCINNATI, OH – In a win for employee freedom, James Carroll, a Kroger employee based near Cincinnati, has secured victory in his federal case against United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW) Local 75 and Kroger. The win comes after Carroll challenged the union and his employer for unlawfully deducting union dues from his paycheck and threatening him with termination for refusing to sign an illegal dues deduction form.

Carroll, with free legal support from the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) Region 9 in Cincinnati. His case exposed the UFCW's use of an unlawful "dual-purpose" membership form, which combines union membership and dues deduction authorization into a single signature. Under established Supreme Court legal precedents, workers have the right to refrain from formal union membership, and any dues deduction authorizations must be voluntary and separate from membership agreements.

In order to avoid further prosecution, Kroger and UFCW entered into a settlement that requires them to reimburse Carroll for the illegally seized dues and publicly post a notice informing other employees of their rights.



Northern Kentucky (foreground) might be just across the Ohio River from Cincinnati, OH, but the difference in worker freedom is stark. Without Right to Work, forced dues abuses are rampant compared to Right to Work Kentucky.

But Carroll didn't stop there. To protect himself from future union coercion, he secured a transfer to a Kroger store in Right to Work Kentucky. Unlike Ohio, where workers can be forced to pay union fees even as non-members, Kentucky's Right to Work law ensures that all union payments are voluntary, shielding Carroll from further threats that he pay up or face termination.

This case challenging the UFCW's forced dues abuse of grocery employees isn't an isolated incident.

In 2023, Houston-area Kroger employee Jessica Haefner, also aided by Foundation attorneys, filed

charges against UFCW for using a dual-purpose form and altering her response to falsely indicate consent for dues deductions. More recently, in 2024, Portland grocery worker Reegin Schaffer won a case against UFCW after union officials ignored her resignation request during a strike and retaliated by attempting to fine her for working.

Another Worker Flees to the Freedom Of Right to Work

"We are pleased with this legal win for Mr. Carroll, and that he is now completely free of union bosses' forced-dues demands in Right to Work Kentucky," commented National Right to Work Foundation Vice President and Legal Director William Messenger. "Unfortunately most workers employed in forced dues states don't have the option to commute to a job in a Right to Work state, which is why workers everywhere need the protection of Right to Work laws." ✚

Foundation Action

Sandra Crandall	Chairman, Board of Trustees
William Messenger	Vice President and Legal Director
Don Loos	Vice President
Patrick Semmens	Vice President and Editor-in-Chief
Mark Mix	President

Distributed by the

National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, Inc.

8001 Braddock Road, Springfield, VA 22160

www.nrtw.org • 1-800-336-3600

The Foundation is a nonprofit, charitable organization providing free legal aid to employees whose human or civil rights have been violated by abuses of compulsory unionism. All contributions to the Foundation are tax deductible under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Connect with us today!

facebook

fb.com/NationalRightToWorkFoundation



@RightToWork

AT&T-BellSouth Workers Challenge Union-Concocted 'Window Period' Restrictions on Ending Dues

CWA officials trap dissenting workers, but case asks NLRB to declare such restrictions illegal

MIAMI, FL – In August 2024, Communications Workers of America (CWA) union bosses ordered thousands of AT&T employees across the Southeast to abandon their jobs and go on strike. Unsurprisingly, despite union officials' propaganda surrounding the strike, many workers disagreed with the decision.

"CWA union officials ordered us to abandon our jobs when many of us just wanted to keep working and supporting ourselves and our families," commented Amanda Marc, a Miami-based worker for AT&T-BellSouth. "That's bad enough, but now they're putting up all these roadblocks to try to prevent those of us who don't like the union's agenda from stopping our money from flowing to them."

Marc is referring to a situation that South Florida AT&T-BellSouth workers have been increasingly dealing with in the aftermath of the strike, which came to an end in September 2024. With free legal aid from National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation staff attorneys, Marc and her coworker Sofia Hernaiz filed unfair labor practice charges against CWA union officials, detailing that the union hierarchy has ignored their requests to cut off dues payments and has continued to siphon money from their paychecks illegally. Additional charges for other AT&T-BellSouth workers are also being filed.

Dues Kept Flowing to Union After Workers Requested Stop

Marc and Hernaiz's charges point out that CWA officials are imposing a "window period" scheme on workers who want to end financial support, limiting to just ten days per year the time in which workers can demand that dues deductions cease from their paychecks.

"This kind of behavior makes me feel like they're really just interested



Jennifer Abruzzo went straight from being a top CWA union lawyer to being General Counsel of the Biden NLRB. Though President Trump fired her, that doesn't mean that workers don't still have to battle the anti-freedom policies she advanced.

in having control over us and taking our money," Marc added.

Marc and Hernaiz filed their charges with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), the agency responsible for enforcing federal labor law. Marc's charge in particular challenges the practice of imposing "window periods" as violating the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA): While the NLRA unfortunately allows union officials to prevent a worker from revoking his or her dues authorization card for the first year after it is initially signed, Marc's charge notes that any further restrictions are unlawful.

"The unions have no statutory license to create tricky and arbitrary 'window periods' to force unwilling employees to keep paying dues," Marc's charges say.

Because Marc, Hernaiz, and their colleagues work in the Right to Work state of Florida, CWA union bosses are forbidden from forcing workers to pay any union dues or fees as a condition of keeping their jobs, though CWA union officials are trying to limit the exercise of this freedom with their window period scheme. In states that lack Right to Work protections, in contrast, union officials can force employees to pay

fees to the union or be terminated, meaning even perfect "compliance" with a union boss's arbitrary window period restriction would not get a worker out of forced union payments.

Marc and Hernaiz's charges state that they, and many of their coworkers, resigned their union memberships in August 2024, which was around when CWA union officials ordered AT&T-BellSouth workers out on the strike. Despite the women's requests to end union membership and stop financial support for the union, the charges read, CWA agents never responded to their requests to stop dues deductions, and never even informed them of the window period dates in which they would consider their requests valid.

Even worse, Hernaiz details in her charge that union officials tried to subject her to internal union discipline for not participating in the strike. Under federal law, union bosses cannot impose union proceedings on workers who are not union members. Foundation attorneys are in the process of aiding other AT&T-BellSouth workers targeted by such illegal discipline.

No Legal Justification for 'Window Periods,' New NLRB Should Toss Policy

"Federal labor law is supposed to protect the right of workers to decide freely whether they want to join or financially support a union," commented National Right to Work Foundation President Mark Mix. "So-called 'window periods' exist only to restrict this freedom just so union officials can continue to funnel dues money from workers' pockets straight into union agendas.

"The NLRB under the new Administration should recognize that this practice contradicts both worker freedom and federal law, and end it accordingly," Mix added. ✚

The Washington Times

Trump Was Right to Tell Biden Labor Board Appointee “You’re Fired!”

Expect the Supreme Court to ultimately vindicate the President’s authority to fire powerful agency appointees

Aaron Solem, National Right to Work Foundation Staff Attorney

President Trump made a smart move when he fired National Labor Relations Board Member Gwynne Wilcox, a Democrat-appointed holdover from the Biden Administration. Ms. Wilcox issued onerous regulations that were struck down in court, and decisions that violated the First Amendment because they called for restricting employees’ access to information about the consequences of unionization.

She is now suing President Trump in a legal gambit to return to power, reigniting a longstanding argument about so-called “independent” agencies. Last week, a district court judge returned Wilcox to office. But the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals is hearing argument today to determine whether she can remain in office while her case is heard. Ultimately, the U.S. Supreme Court is expected to have the final say on the legality of Wilcox’s removal. It’s an argument Trump is likely to win in the end, and the country will be better governed if he does.

The NLRB consists of five presidential appointees and wields immense power over most private sector employees. The NLRB decides who can vote in union representation elections, adjudicates disputes between unions and employers, seeks injunctions in federal courts, and punishes labor law violators. It can impose monopoly union representation on unwilling employees and compel unwilling employers to bargain with unions. It can even order shuttered businesses to reopen.

The problem is that, while presidents appoint Board members subject to Senate confirmation, the National Labor Relations Act says Board members can only be removed for “neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.” This means that the NLRB operates independently of the President and is overseen by no one. If the President disagrees with a Board member’s decision, he’s powerless to exert any control over this executive branch official.

Ms. Wilcox’s position in her lawsuit illustrates the point. She was fired because President Trump had lost faith in her ability to properly enforce the law. In his email to Wilcox explaining her termination, Trump wrote that she had issued decisions that “vastly exceeded the bounds of the National Labor Relations Act.”

According to Ms. Wilcox, there is nothing President Trump could do about that—she and other Board members are entitled

to wield executive power free from the President’s control for the entirety of their terms in office. Given that Ms. Wilcox’s term lasts until 2028, President Trump would be saddled with her and her rogue actions for virtually the rest of his presidency. The President would not control one of his own executive branch agencies, making the NLRB effectively part of a fourth branch of government.

This violates Article II of the Constitution, which vests in the President all Executive power. The Supreme Court has held since the 1920s that this power includes the power to control and remove subordinate executive officials.

In her lawsuit, Ms. Wilcox claims the Supreme Court’s 1935 decision in *Humphrey’s Executor* exempts her and other members of federal boards from the President’s executive authority. Not true. In *Humphrey’s Executor*, the Supreme Court upheld removal protections for the Federal Trade Commission because the Court believed the 1935 FTC’s primary function was preparing reports for Congress.

The NLRB is nothing like the 1935 FTC because it exercises substantial executive powers—powers that Article II of the Constitution vests solely in the President. And unlike the 1935 FTC, the Board is not a body of technical experts balanced along partisan lines. Rather, the NLRB is a highly partisan body of policymakers.

The district court judge who restored Wilcox chided President Trump for acting like a “king.” But the judge has it backwards. An unelected bureaucrat, accountable to no one, wielding immense power over the lives of Americans is far closer to a king than a democratically-elected President. The Founders did not fight and die in a war so we could be ruled by bureaucrats free from political accountability.

President Trump has the sole duty and authority under Article II of the Constitution to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. If President Trump lost faith in Ms. Wilcox, or never had any to begin with, he was well within his right to remove her from the Board.

A version of this op-ed ran on March 17, 2025, in The Washington Times.



Watch Mark Mix break down
Trump’s NLRB battle:
www.nrtw.org/nlrboan

NY Healthcare Worker Asks Labor Board to Unblock Vote to Oust SEIU

Sun River Health employees' election abruptly canceled by NLRB officials

LONG ISLAND, NY – Laura Gallo, a senior patient representative at Sun River Health in Long Island, NY, thought she'd secured a rare chance for her and her coworkers to vote out the 1199SEIU United Healthcare Workers East union. Her goal? Give hundreds of colleagues a chance to escape from unwanted union "representation."

Unfortunately, on February 13, 2025, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) Region 29 Director abruptly derailed her campaign citing a dubious technicality. Now, with free legal aid from National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation staff attorneys, Gallo is battling to reverse the ruling and expose a system that allows union legal trickery to block workers from voting on whether a union deserves to remain in their workplace.

Legal Hurdles Undermine Right to Remove Unwanted Unions

Despite the clear right of employees under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to petition for decertification elections to free themselves of unwanted union "representation," numerous NLRB-invented rules and policies give union officials the ability to block or delay employee-requested decertification votes.

In Gallo's case, not only did she need to collect signatures for the required 30% of the bargaining unit, but because she works in the healthcare industry, NLRB rules require her to file the petition within a short window before the union contract expires. If she missed the window, union officials could have blocked her vote for up to three years under the Board-invented "contract bar" policy.

Despite navigating the complicated process pro se (without formal legal representation), Gallo nailed the timing, submitting her petition with



Laura Gallo is passionate about the work she does at Sun River Health to improve the wellbeing of people across Long Island. She's now using that same passion to win her coworkers a chance to vote out divisive SEIU union bosses.

the supporting signatures of her coworkers in August 2024, following instructions from NLRB officials to trigger the vote. At that point, the decertification was on track, with the company and union agreeing to how the election would be run.

Only then did the NLRB Regional Director, possibly due to improper backchannel communications with union lawyers, suddenly cancel the scheduled vote without providing any meaningful explanation to Gallo or Sun River attorneys. When the full Board in Washington, D.C., was asked to review the case, the Regional official suddenly "clarified" that additional signatures in support of the petition arrived just outside the contract bar window, meaning under a 1993 precedent the decertification election request could be rejected under the contract bar.

In February, having retained National Right to Work Foundation staff attorneys to represent her, Gallo filed a Request for Review with the NLRB in Washington, asking that the Regional Director's decision be overturned.

The filing argues that her election should be allowed to go forward because she followed the Board agent's instructions and, as a pro se petitioner, she should receive the benefit of the doubt when it comes to estimating the total number of signatures needed to trigger a vote.

This decertification effort isn't the only battle Ms. Gallo is fighting against the 1199SEIU union.

Pending unfair labor practice charges Gallo filed against the union show why many workers have likely soured on the union: The charges maintain that SEIU union officials unlawfully interfered with access to the hospital, took pictures of Gallo without her consent as an intimidation tactic, and engaged in other disruptive and coercive behaviors that were so egregious local police were called to end the disruption.

Time to End NLRB's Rigged Rules that Protect Incumbent Union Bosses

Gallo's case is one of many where Foundation attorneys are asking the Board to overturn non-statutory barriers that workers face when trying to remove unions they oppose.

"Ms. Gallo's case pulls back the curtain on how NLRB policies are rigged against individual workers to protect unpopular incumbent union bosses," observed National Right to Work Foundation Vice President and Legal Director William Messenger. "She followed NLRB agents' instructions, navigated the Board-created 'window' for filing her petition, and even got an election scheduled, yet the Regional Director blocked the vote and handed SEIU bosses a gift at the expense of Gallo and her coworkers' rights.

"The NLRA, which the NLRB is supposed to neutrally enforce, only has one limitation on a workers' right to vote out a union they oppose, which is a previous vote within the last year," added Messenger. "All the other NLRB-invented policies and bars should be eliminated so workers can fully exercise their right to free themselves of unwanted unions." ✊



Foundation-Backed Baristas Support Trump's Firing of Biden NLRB Member

Starbucks employees' challenge to agency power boosted by firing of Biden Board Member

WASHINGTON, DC – President Trump isn't the only person seeking reform in the federal government. Several National Right to Work Foundation-backed workers have advanced lawsuits in federal courts challenging the constitutionality of a federal agency.

Two upstate New York Starbucks baristas (Ariana Cortes and Logan Karam), represented by Foundation staff attorneys, filed the first case in the nation challenging NLRB members' removal protections.

Their case advanced a revolutionary argument that the National Labor Relations Act's (NLRA) removal protections for NLRB members -- which protect them from presidential removal during their entire terms except in very rare cases -- let them exercise executive power in violation of separation of powers doctrines in Article II of the Constitution.

This power is plain to see -- unelected NLRB members have the power to decide who can vote in union elections, adjudicate disputes between employers and unions, impose one-size-fits-all union "representation" on employees who don't want it, and much more.

Showdown Over Removal of Biden Appointee Headed for SCOTUS

President Trump utilized the same arguments when he announced he was ousting Biden-appointed NLRB member Gwynne Wilcox (a former SEIU union lawyer) for issuing radical decisions that "vastly exceeded the bounds" of federal law. Wilcox's lawyers sued Trump over the removal, arguing -- wrongly -- that NLRB members' removal protections are valid and prevent the President from doing virtually anything to stop NLRB members who have gone rogue.

The case between President Trump and Gwynne Wilcox has now



It may not look like much, but this Starbucks store in downtown Buffalo, NY, is the place where barista Ariana Cortes started her trailblazing legal battle against both the SBWU union and a hostile NLRB bureaucracy.

joined Cortes and Karam's suit in being considered by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. As this issue goes to print, the Supreme Court has ordered Wilcox off the NLRB while it decides whether Wilcox should remain off the NLRB while the case is ongoing. Foundation attorneys submitted a legal brief on behalf of Cortes and Karam backing the President's contentions.

Cortes and Karam's brief focuses on how the Board's powers to enforce federal labor law, lack of technical expertise, and the partisan nature of its membership are not characteristics of a federal agency where removal protections might be appropriate under Supreme Court caselaw. The brief also argues that reinstating Wilcox would cause chaos because it would let her participate in deciding cases before the NLRB while her continued presence on the Board is still the subject of litigation.

"Cortes and Karam have a vital interest in the outcome of this case, and not only because it concerns the constitutionality of [NLRB member removal protections]," the brief says. "Cortes and Karam do not want an individual the President properly removed from the Board because of her unsound rulings -- Gwynne Wilcox -- to decide their pending NLRB cases."

Because of the weighty constitutional matters at stake, many have already predicted that this question will likely receive final

consideration from the U.S. Supreme Court.

Cortes and Karam's lawsuit is fully briefed at the D.C. Circuit Court, and a hearing is scheduled for May. Their case was spurred by NLRB bureaucrats' decision to block the baristas and their coworkers from exercising their right to vote to decertify (or remove) Starbucks Workers United (SBWU) union officials. NLRB Region 3 rejected petitions in which a sufficient number of coworkers from both Cortes' and Karam's upstate New York Starbucks locations requested such elections. Regional NLRB officials cited unfair labor practice accusations made by SBWU union officials against the Starbucks Corporation as the reason for barring the votes. Notably, there was no established link between these allegations and the employees' decertification requests.

Starbucks Baristas' Battle Promotes Liberty for Workers Across Country

"Ms. Cortes and Mr. Karam spoke up on behalf of untold numbers of independent-minded workers nationwide when they filed their federal lawsuit challenging the NLRB's constitutionality," commented National Right to Work Foundation Vice President Patrick Semmens. "The NLRB regularly stops workers from exercising their rights to push back against union influence for any reason union bosses dream up. Board members' ability to do this without fearing any accountability to the elected President has effectively turned the agency into a fourth branch of government.

"We hope the Starbucks baristas' lawsuit, boosted by the President's efforts to reform the government, eventually results in lasting change to the Board that protects worker freedom," Semmens added. ✚



Make A Difference! Donate Today to the Fight Against Forced Unionism

With a new administration in power, your Foundation has a unique opportunity to roll back coercive union power. National Right to Work Foundation attorneys are positioned to advance worker freedom through litigation at the National Labor Relations Board, in state and federal courts, and even the U.S. Supreme Court.

So please consider a planned gift today to make a much-needed investment in the Foundation's cutting-edge Strategic Litigation Program.

Gifts of cash and appreciated stock are popular giving tools right now, but a qualified charitable distribution (QCD) from your IRA is also an option. If you are 70 ½ or older, instead of taking a Required Minimum Distribution, you can instruct your IRA custodian to transfer any amount up to \$100,000 directly to the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, a qualified charity (Tax ID#59-1588825). By doing so, your QCD will NOT be included in your taxable income for 2025!

Instructions for a gift of Stock or Securities:

Beneficiary:	National Right to Work Legal Defense and Education Foundation, Inc. 8001 Braddock Road, Suite 600 Springfield, VA 22151	Receiving Bank:	Merrill Lynch
		Account Number:	86Q-04155
		DTC Number:	8862

As with all planned gifts, or estate matters, we urge you to consult your tax advisor or estate attorney before making a gift. Thank you in advance for your investment in the Foundation and its vital work. We appreciate your generosity!

If you have any questions, please contact Ginny Smith, Director of Strategic Programs, at 1-800-336-3600, ext. 3303 or gms@nrtw.org.

Foundation Counters Longstanding Union Powers

continued from page 1

for established unions.

While Hause and her colleagues are fighting for a vote to free themselves from forced dues, attacking the merger doctrine also has significant ramifications for workers seeking to decertify a union. Foundation attorneys have represented many workers who have been shanghaied into huge, inescapable work units against their will. That includes a group of less than 10 Wisconsin First Student workers who filed a majority-backed petition to remove Teamsters officials as soon as allowed by federal law, only to be stymied by the merger doctrine because they had been secretly “merged” into a multi-company unit of around 24,000 workers in multiple states.

WV Homecare Workers Not ‘Settling’ for ‘Settlement Bar’

Meanwhile, in West Virginia, a Foundation-assisted employee of senior homecare nonprofit McDowell County Commission on Aging is attacking the NLRB's use of another union boss-friendly policy to block his and his coworkers' effort to kick out Service Employees International Union (SEIU) bosses: the so-called “settlement bar,” which lets unions and employers unilaterally agree in settlements to end employee-led union decertification efforts.

The employee, John Reeves, and his coworkers cast ballots in a July 2024 vote to remove SEIU union officials, but are now battling claims that a settlement SEIU bosses and Commission management signed should relegate those ballots to the trash bin. The SEIU and Commission entered into the settlement to end the decertification and resolve unfair labor practice allegations union agents had filed against the employer. That supposed employer wrongdoing was cited as the impetus for Reeves and his coworkers'

Workers Ask Trump NLRB to End Tyrannical Union Tactics

continued from page 7

desire to remove the union -- even though it was never admitted to by the employer nor proven by union lawyers.

Instead of letting Reeves show why the union's accusations didn't cause his employees' disenchantment with the union, regional NLRB officials instead invoked the settlement bar and dismissed the decertification effort, based on the phony "resolution" of speculative charges by the union. Reeves is asking the NLRB in Washington, D.C., to review his case.

Reform Needed to Undo Coercive Policy

"Ms. Hause's and Mr. Reeves' cases provide just a sampling of the grand buffet of privileges the NLRB has granted union bosses over the years," observed National Right to Work Foundation Vice President Patrick Semmens. "Union bosses and complicit employers should not be able to cut workers off from exercising their basic right to remove unpopular union bosses, yet that's exactly what both the 'merger doctrine' and 'settlement bar' allow.

"If members of the Trump NLRB are dedicated to defending the rights of all American workers, they will focus not only on countering the extensive damage done to individual worker rights by the Biden Labor Board, but also on digging deeper to undo the web of non-statutory coercive union boss powers that has been created over decades," Semmens added. 🇺🇸

EXTRA! EXTRA!

Newsclips Requested!

Send articles exposing abusive union practices from your local paper to:

NRTWLDF

ATTN: Newsclip Appeal
8001 Braddock Road, Ste. 600
Springfield, VA 22160

Or by email to: info@NRTW.org



Message from Mark Mix

President
National Right to Work
Legal Defense Foundation

Dear Foundation Supporter,

Though Big Labor might not want to acknowledge it, American workers prefer living and working in states where their Right to Work is protected.

Looking at any metric reveals that working men and women and their families are flocking to the freedom and economic opportunity that Right to Work states provide. Economic data shows that Right to Work states have twice the employment growth of their counterparts where union bosses can demand workers pay dues or be fired.

Yet it's important to remember that no set of statistics, no matter how overwhelmingly pro-Right to Work, can ever account for the fundamental injustice workers face when subjected to forced unionism.

For the employees Foundation staff attorneys represent every day, defending their freedoms against union boss attacks is very personal.

Take the case of James Carroll (page 2), a Cincinnati-area Kroger supermarket clerk who challenged an illegal scheme by UFCW union bosses to seize union dues from his paycheck against his will in violation of longstanding precedent.

With your support and the Foundation's legal expertise, James won his case. Yet, even after winning his case against the UFCW for violating his rights, Ohio's lack of a Right to Work law means he could still be required to pay those same UFCW union bosses or else be fired.

For James that wasn't tolerable, so he exercised an option most workers trapped in forced-dues ranks cannot. He was able to transfer to a Kroger store across the Ohio River in nearby Right to Work Kentucky.

Of course, most workers in James' situation -- opposed to union affiliation but forced to fund union bosses' agenda anyway -- aren't fortunate enough to be able to commute or easily move to a Right to Work state.

That's why your continued support is so vital. All workers, no matter where in the country they work, must be able to defend themselves against union boss coercion.

Thank you for helping us in this righteous fight to defend employee freedom.

Sincerely,