



NLRB General Counsel Announces Broad Interpretation of Joint Employer Status

In a press release last week, the Office of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) announced its position that McDonald's, USA, LLC is a joint employer of the employees of its franchisees. This signals a dramatic reversal in the position of the NLRB that franchisors and franchisees are not joint employers, single employers or alter egos.

The press release noted that 181 cases involving McDonald's have been filed since November 2012: 68 of which were found to have no merit, 64 of which are currently pending investigation and 43 of which have been found to have merit. According to the General Counsel, "McDonald's franchisees and/or McDonald's, USA, LLC" will be named as a respondent in the complaints issued by the NLRB in the 43 cases if the parties are unable to reach a settlement. This announcement comes at a time when the NLRB is considering revising the standard it uses to evaluate alleged joint employer relationships. The General Counsel has asked the NLRB to expand the contours of the joint employment test. *See Browning-Ferris Industries* (Case 32-RC-109684).

The General Counsel's announcement represents yet another effort by the current administration to curry favor with the AFL-CIO by making it easier for unions to organize worksites. Thus, we can expect similar initiatives from other federal agencies, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Department of Labor reaching the same conclusion (e.g., under the Fair Labor Standards Act and Executive Order 11246, to name a few). However, because the definition of "employer" or "joint employer" differs from statute to statute, the decision as to each will necessarily turn on the applicable statutory language.

Presently, the weight of authority under federal anti-discrimination statutes, such as Title VII, rejects joint employer status for franchisors such as McDonald's. *See, e.g. Evans v. McDonald's Corp.*, 936 F.2d 1087 (10th Cir. 1991) (considering NLRB factors and holding McDonald's was not an employer of its franchisee's employees under Title VII); *Alberter v. McDonald's Corp.*, 70 F.Supp.2d 1138 (D. Nev. 1999)

(same); *Gray v. McDonald's USA, LLC*, 874 F.Supp.2d 743 (E.D. Tenn. 2012) (holding McDonald's was not an employer of its franchisee's employee under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 and the state anti-discrimination statute). However, with the federal government and agencies focusing on this issue, that may change. Commonly franchised industries, such as food service and hospitality, will no doubt be watching these developments very closely, as a shift in the law could have significant impact on the entire franchise business model.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by Peter Zinober and Katie Molloy. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [Peter W. Zinober](mailto:zinoberp@gtlaw.com) | +1 813.318.5725 | zinoberp@gtlaw.com
- > [Katie Molloy](mailto:molloyk@gtlaw.com) | +1 813.318.5710 | molloyk@gtlaw.com
- > Or your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

Albany +1 518.689.1400	Denver +1 303.572.6500	New York +1 212.801.9200	Shanghai +86 (0) 21 6391 6633
Amsterdam +31 (0) 20 301 7300	Fort Lauderdale +1 954.765.0500	Northern Virginia +1 703.749.1300	Silicon Valley +1 650.328.8500
Atlanta +1 678.553.2100	Houston +1 713.374.3500	Orange County +1 949.732.6500	Tallahassee +1 850.222.6891
Austin +1 512.320.7200	Las Vegas +1 702.792.3773	Orlando +1 407.420.1000	Tampa +1 813.318.5700
Boca Raton +1 561.955.7600	London* +44 (0) 203 349 8700	Philadelphia +1 215.988.7800	Tel Aviv^ +972 (0) 3 636 6000
Boston +1 617.310.6000	Los Angeles +1 310.586.7700	Phoenix +1 602.445.8000	Warsaw~ +48 22 690 6100
Chicago +1 312.456.8400	Mexico City+ 52 (1) 55 5029 0000	Sacramento +1 916.442.1111	Washington, D.C. +1 202.331.3100
Dallas +1 214.665.3600	Miami +1 305.579.0500	San Francisco +1 415.655.1300	Westchester County +1 914.286.2900
Delaware +1 302.661.7000	New Jersey +1 973.360.7900	Seoul∞ +82 (0) 2 369 1000	West Palm Beach +1 561.650.7900

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. *Operates as Greenberg Traurig Maher LLP. **Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ∞Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2014 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*