



August 2016

National Labor Relations Board Extends Reach of *Browning-Ferris* Joint Employment

On July 11, 2016, the National Labor Relations Board extended the reach of its ground-breaking 2015 *Browning-Ferris* decision, which announced an expansive view of “joint employment,” and ruled that “employer consent is not necessary” to require multiple employers to jointly bargain with “units that combine jointly employed and solely employed employees of a single user employer.” *Miller & Anderson, Inc.* (NLRB July 11, 2016). In other words, if, for example, an employer has ten workers performing a similar job function, five of whom it employs directly and the other five of whom are provided through a “supplier” agency, the employer can be required to collectively bargain, together with the “supplier” employer, as to all ten employees.

The *Miller* Board majority expressly overruled the NLRB’s 2004 *Oakwood Care Center* decision in favor of the Board’s 2000 decision in *M.B. Sturgis*, under which the NLRB applies “community of interest factors to decide if such units are appropriate.” “In sum,” the majority said, “a *Sturgis* unit comprises employees who, working side by side, are part of a common enterprise.”

As is often the case, the dissenting opinion (submitted by Board Member Miscimarra) details just how radical a departure the majority’s ruling is from established precedent. The dissent observed that the NLRB may now “require two or more businesses to engage in multi-employer bargaining without their consent, even though one of the entities *has no employment relationship* with some of the unit employees, provided that *other* employees in the same unit are jointly employed by the employer entities.” Given the uncertainty *Browning-Ferris* creates over which businesses might be joint employers, its expansion in *Miller* “will only make it more difficult for parties to anticipate whether, when or where this new type of multi-employer/non-employer bargaining will be required by the Board, nor can anyone reasonably predict what it will mean in practice.”

The dissent also refuted the majority’s assertion that it was merely “returning” to the *Sturgis* rule: “Throughout the 4-year period governed by *Sturgis* (and for many years before and after *Sturgis* was decided), the joint-employer landscape was circumscribed by well-known limiting principles that were repudiated, with considerable fanfare, in *Browning-Ferris*. Thus, my colleagues do not ‘return’ to a legal regime that has ever existed.” Member Miscimarra took further exception as “the available evidence indicates no employees of the Employers will be affected by the Board’s decision in this case, which means the Board is essentially issuing an advisory opinion that overrules existing precedent.”

The *Miller* decision is but the latest instance of the current Board’s increasingly liberal and union-friendly interpretation of federal labor law.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **Michael J. Slocum** and **Jerrold F. Goldberg**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [Michael J. Slocum](mailto:slocumm@gtlaw.com) | +1 973.360.7900 | slocumm@gtlaw.com
- > [Jerrold F. Goldberg](mailto:goldbergj@gtlaw.com) | +1 212.801.9209 | goldbergj@gtlaw.com
- > Any member of Greenberg Traurig’s [Labor & Employment Group](#)
- > Or, your [Greenberg Traurig](#) Attorney

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Albany +1 518.689.1400 | Delaware +1 302.661.7000 | New York +1 212.801.9200 | Silicon Valley +1 650.328.8500 |
| Amsterdam + 31 20 301 7300 | Denver +1 303.572.6500 | Northern Virginia +1 703.749.1300 | Tallahassee +1 850.222.6891 |
| Atlanta +1 678.553.2100 | Fort Lauderdale +1 954.765.0500 | Orange County +1 949.732.6500 | Tampa +1 813.318.5700 |
| Austin +1 512.320.7200 | Houston +1 713.374.3500 | Orlando +1 407.420.1000 | Tel Aviv[^] +972 (0) 3.636.6000 |
| Berlin⁻ +49 (0) 30 700 171 100 | Las Vegas +1 702.792.3773 | Philadelphia +1 215.988.7800 | Tokyo^α +81 (0)3 4510 2200 |
| Berlin-GT Restructuring⁻ +49 (0) 30 700 171 100 | London[*] +44 (0)203 349 8700 | Phoenix +1 602.445.8000 | Warsaw[~] +48 22 690 6100 |
| Boca Raton +1 561.955.7600 | Los Angeles +1 310.586.7700 | Sacramento +1 916.442.1111 | Washington, D.C. +1 202.331.3100 |
| Boston +1 617.310.6000 | Mexico City⁺ +52 55 5029.0000 | San Francisco +1 415.655.1300 | Westchester County +1 914.286.2900 |
| Chicago +1 312.456.8400 | Miami +1 305.579.0500 | Seoul[∞] +82 (0) 2.369.1000 | West Palm Beach +1 561.650.7900 |
| Dallas +1 214.665.3600 | New Jersey +1 973.360.7900 | Shanghai +86 (0) 21.6391.6633 | |

*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. –Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. – Berlin - GT Restructuring is operated by Köhler-Ma Geiser Partnerschaft Rechtsanwälte, Insolvenzverwalter. *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 Tokyo Law Offices are operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ~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. ©2016 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*