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HOW TO USE THE CPER ANNUAL INDEX

The 2007 issues of the CPER bimonthly periodical — No. 182 (February) through No. 187 (December) — are indexed in this edition of the annual CPER Index.

The Index is arranged in four parts to provide convenient access to information. The first part is a topical index, the second is a table of all court decisions reported in CPER periodicals, the third is a table of decisions of the Public Employment Relations Board, and the fourth is an index of arbitration awards abstracted in the periodical. Each part is described below.

Key to CPER References

References to material in CPER consist of issue and page number, appearing at the end of each entry. For example, page 22 in CPER No. 186 is printed as 186:22. References are only to the first page of an article.

Part I: General Index

This part is the basic topical index to CPER. Under each main topic appear: (1) cross references to related topics (or if it is not a main topic, reference to the main topic under which material on that subject is indexed); (2) feature articles by title, with authors noted; (3) annotations of “recent development” news stories; and (4) annotations of Public Employment Relations Board cases reported in these issues.

Cases in the General Index under each topic serve as a subject key to cases that appear in the separate tables of court cases (Part II) and PERB rulings (Part III). (Parts II and III provide complete case titles, official citations, and case annotations, but no subject indexing. See full explanation below.) The PERB cases under each topic include all final board decisions, whether they were reported in a news story or abstracted in the CPER log of PERB rulings.

To accommodate the specialized use of the Index for research of arbitration issues, arbitration awards are indexed separately in Part IV. In the General Index, they appear with the entry “arbitration log.” (See description of Part IV, below.)

Unions and associations are listed in the General Index under the topic Employee Organizations. Employers are under Employers, California Public. Most news stories are indexed by employer and employee organization, as well as by topic. All material regarding any one employer (news story, arbitration case, or court or PERB ruling) is indexed by name of the employer.

Major statutes appear as General Index topics (such as Dills Act). New legislation is indexed under the topic, Legislation, as well as under subject headings.
Part II: Table of Cases

This table includes all court cases reported in the 2007 issues of CPER. The official title of each case is followed by a brief statement of the court's holding, the official court citations, and the citation to CPER analysis of the decision.

Part III: Table of PERB Orders and Decisions

This table contains two sections.

Section A is an annotated table of all final rulings of the Public Employment Relations Board, whether abstracted in the CPER log of PERB rulings or featured in a news story. The table is presented in subdivisions reflecting the seven statutes under PERB's jurisdiction. This volume contains cases under the Dills Act, the Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA), the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act (MMBA), and the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (Trial Court Act). Each case title is followed by the PERB decision number, year, and reference to the case synopsis appearing in the log of PERB decisions in each issue of CPER.

Section B is a key to case titles by PERB decision number.

Decisions are indexed by topic and by employer in the General Index (Part I).

Part IV: Index of Arbitration

This part is a separate index of arbitration awards that were abstracted in the “Arbitration Log” in each periodical. Entries are arranged by the issue in dispute (based on the headnotes used in the Log). In addition, a list of neutrals' names and CPER citations to their awards is provided. Awards also are indexed by name of employer in the General Index (Part I).
PART I

GENERAL INDEX

A

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES
Quasi-Judicial SPB Whistleblower Findings Must Be Challenged by W rit of Administrative Mandate Before Suit/183:67
Parties Alleging Constitutional Violations Must Exhaust Administrative Remedies Before Filing Suit/180:85
Whistleblower Must File Petition for W rit of Mandate to Test if CSU ‘Satisfactorily Addressed’ Complaint/184:66

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967 (ADEA)
see also Discrimination — Age
Bias Imputed to Employer Where Subordinate Initiates and Influences Investigation/186:67

AGENCY FEES
Supreme Court Upholds Limits on Agency Fee Spending (Carol Vendrillo)/185:21

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)
No Individual or State Liability for ADA Violations/182:66
Who Do Disability Discrimination Laws Protect? (M. Carol Stevens and Alison Heartfield Moller)/184:17

ARBITRATION
Adverse Arbitration Award Does Not Bar Statutory Claims/187:36
Allegations of Attempted Poisoning Unfounded, Skelly Violations Abound/182:76
Arbitrator Cannot Reform Contract That Has Been Approved by Legislature/185:50
Conflict in Evidence Results in Reinstatement of Grievant/184:92
Contractual Notice Requirement Denied in City’s Jail Closure/187:76
Court Overturns PERB’s Reading of CSU Arbitration Statute/187:45
Federal Laws Preempt Parties’ Agreement When Special Education Student Is Involved/183:84
Grievant Reinstated After Termination for Sexual Harassment/185:79
Interest Arbitration Law Still Unconstitutional, Superior Court Judge Rules/183:37
LAO’s Compensation Recommendations Include Limiting Arbitrator Remedies and Ending Formulas/183:64
Law Firm’s Mandatory Arbitration Clause Found Unconscionable/185:80
Safety Union Still Fighting for Pension Retroactivity/184:64
State Cannot Add Terms to Arbitrator’s Contract Without Unions’ Consent/186:77
Tension in the Public Safety Officers Bill of Rights: Interrogations Versus Routine Supervisor-Subordinate Communications (John B. LaRocco)/186:5

ATTORNEY’S FEES
Sheriffs Association Wins Attorney’s Fees in Bill of Rights Case/185:27

B

BENEFITS
see Health Care Benefits Pay and Benefits

BROWN ACT
Navigating the Murky Waters of Employee Notice Requirements Under the Brown Act’s Personnel Exception (Randy Riddle and Erich Shiners)/187:11
No Invasion of Privacy or Defamation Where Principal Criticized in the Press/184:87
Demoted High School Principal Has Right to Attend Board Meeting/186:32
BUDGET
Court Shoots Down Attempts to Scrimp on Pension Contributions/186:72
U.C. Labor Studies' Funding Up in the Air Again/182:65

CALIFORNIA FAMILY RIGHTS ACT (CFRA)
Employee Should Have Been Notified of Right to CFRA Leave/185:67
Governor Vetoes Family Leave Legislation/187:69

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM (CALPERS)
see also Retirement and Pensions
CalPERS Again Sponsoring Anti-Fraud Legislation/183:63
Court Shoots Down Attempts to Scrimp on Pension Contributions/186:72

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT (CPRA)
Bill to Open Police Officer Disciplinary Hearings Introduced/183:36
Public Access to Information Expanded by High Court/186:75
Why Police Agencies Must Disclose an Officer's Name, Salary, and More (Brian E. Pellis)/187:21

CERTIFICATION OF BARGAINING UNIT
see Representation Elections, Recognition, and Decertification Procedures

CITIES
see Employers, California Public — Cities (for entries regarding each city by name)

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS AND MERIT SYSTEMS
Receiver Points to SPB as Obstacle in Prison Reform/182:55

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
DPA Declares Impasse in CCPoa Talks/184:57
Factfinding Report Leads to New Faculty Contract/184:73
Hayward Teachers Get Contract After 10-Day Strike/184:34
LAUSD and UTLA Agree on Contract/183:43
LAO's Compensation Recommendations Include Limiting Arbitrator Remedies and Ending Formulas/183:64
Retiree Health Benefits: Still Misdunderstood... Still Protected (Robert J. Bezemek)/186:13
State Attorneys Go to Court Over Low Salaries/186:46
The Evolution of a Negotiator (Gregory J. Dannis)/183:20
U.C. and UPTE-CWA HX Reach Tentative Agreement/183:50
U.C.'s Health Care Workers Struggle to Have a Say in Pension Bargaining/182:63
U.C. Student Employees Gain New Benefits/187:48
West Contra Costa Teachers Vote to Strike/185:41

COMMUNITY COLLEGES — IN GENERAL
Community College's Administrative Reorganization Does Not Require Consultation With Faculty Senate/184:35

CONTRACT CLAIMS
Retiree Health Benefits: Still Misdunderstood... Still Protected (Robert J. Bezemek)/186:13
Weathering the Gathering Storm Over Post-Retirement Health Care Benefits — Vested or Not (Jeffrey Sloan, Genevieve N g, and Merlyn Goeschl)/184:5

CONTRACTING OUT; PRESERVATION OF UNIT WORK
Contractual Notice Requirement Denied in City's Jail Closure/187:76
Supreme Court Backs Caltrans and Private Contractors in Prop. 35 Case/184:59
Supreme Court Bats Down Another PECG Attempt to Skirt Prop. 35/187:55

COURT EMPLOYEES
Going Into Labor: The Birth of Trial Courts as Employers (Tula Bogdanos and Dena Graff)/182:5

D

DECERTIFICATION
Challenge to Local Decert Rule Barred/182:50

DEMOTION
No Appealable Demotion for Reduction of Employee Work Responsibilities/185:29
DISQUALITY
see also Discrimination — Disability
Firefighters
Reasonable Accommodation
Firefighter Heart Disease Presumption Supports Service-Connected Retirement/182:48

DISCIPLINE AND DISCHARGE (JUST CAUSE FOR)
see also Layoffs
Allegations of Attempted Poisoning Unfounded, Skelly
Violations Abound/182:76
Bill to Open Police Officer Disciplinary Hearings
Introduced/183:36
Commission’s Reduction of Discipline Was Abuse of
Discretion/184:55
Conflicts in Evidence Result in Reinstatement of Grievant/184:92
Discharge Rejected for Misconduct That Occurred Two
Years Prior to Administrative Complaint/186:39
Grievant Reinstated After Termination for Sexual
Harassment/185:79
Insufficient Notice of Prohibited Drugs Invalidates
Termination/186:51
Lying by State Employees in an Investigation Is a Separate
Act With Its Own Deadline for Discipline/183:57
Public Employees May ‘Stand Mute’ in Interrogations
Absent Immunity Grant (Carol Vendrillo)/182:27

DISCRIMINATION — AGE
Age Discrimination Claim Against Google Allowed to
Proceed to Trial/187:73

DISCRIMINATION — DISABILITY
see also Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
Disability
Reasonable Accommodation
California Supreme Court Makes It Harder for Disabled
Employees to Prove Discrimination/186:62
Disabled Employee Must Make Specific Request for
Accommodation/185:69
Employee Should Have Been Notified of Right to CFRA
Leave/185:67
Hearing-Impaired Security Officer Not Disabled Under
Rehabilitation Act/183:71
No Adverse Action Where Disabled Employee Assigned
Less Than Ideal Job/184:78
No Individual or State Liability for ADA Violations/182:66
Employee’s Reports of Physical Threats State Public Policy
for Wrongful Discharge Claim/185:73
Wrongfully Terminated Disabled Employee Entitled to
Backpay/185:76

DISCRIMINATION — GENDER
Schwarzenegger Signs Bill to Protect Gay and Lesbian
Students; Opponents Vow to Fight/187:40

DISCRIMINATION — IN GENERAL
see also Americans with Disabilities Act
Retaliation
Sexual Harassment
Workers’ Compensation
State Senate Passes Bill to Ban ‘Family Status’
Discrimination/185:72
Truth & Consequences: The Practical and Legal Impact of
a Good Investigation (Rebecca Speer)/185:15

DISCRIMINATION — RACE
Race Discrimination Verdict in Favor of L.A. County Police
Officers Overturned/184:79

DISCRIMINATION — RELIGIOUS
Employee Religious Rights and Sexual Harassment:
Competing Policies (Richard Whitmore)/183:15
Religion, Public Schools, and the Public Workplace (Alan
Hersh)/182:17

DISCRIMINATION — SEXUAL ORIENTATION
Schwarzenegger Vetoes Bill to Counteract Ledbetter/187:68
Supreme Court Interprets Time Limit Narrowly in Pay
Discrimination Case/185:61
Union Violates Duty of Fair Representation and Title VII/
187:70

DISCRIMINATION — SEX
Schwarzenegger Signs Bill to Protect Gay and Lesbian
Students; Opponents Vow to Fight/187:40

DUE PROCESS
Class-Of-One Equal Protection Claim Inapplicable to
Public Employer/183:73
Five-Day Limit to Request Hearing Violates Due Process/
184:40
Insufficient Notice of Prohibited Drugs Invalidates
Termination/186:51
N o Due Process Violation Where 'Skelly' Officer Investigated Employee Misconduct/183:34
Notice of Probationary Release Untimely: Teacher Reelected/184:38

DUTY OF FAIR REPRESENTATION
Union Violates Duty of Fair Representation and Title VII/187:70

DUTY TO BARGAIN (MEET AND CONFER) IN GOOD FAITH
Contract Violation Regarding Permissive Subject of Bargaining Not Unfair Practice/182:71
Decision to Contract Out Law Enforcement Services Subject to Meet and Confer Duty Under MMBA/187:34

EDUCATION CODE
Calculation of Full-Time Assignment Dependent on District Practice/183:45
Classifying Teachers as Temporary Employees Based Only on Certification Invalid/182:41
Community College's Administrative Reorganization Does Not Require Consultation With Faculty Senate/184:35
Five-Day Limit to Request Hearing Violates Due Process/184:40
Four-Year Evidence Bar Not Absolute in Proceeding to Dismiss Teacher Accused of Sexual Misconduct/185:37
Notice of Probationary Release Untimely: Teacher Reelected/184:38
School District May Not Deduct Existing Employee's Salary From Absent Employee's Pay/183:47
School District Must Designate Senior Management Employee/187:38
Schwarzenegger Signs Bill to Protect Gay and Lesbian Students; Opponents Vow to Fight/187:40
Teacher Credentialing, Classification, and Seniority: The Ed. Code Rules (Thomas J. Driscoll, Jr.)/183:5
Teachers Serving Under Provisional Credentials Are Probationary Employees Entitled to Rights/184:42
Teachers Union's Use of School Mailboxes Restricted/186:28

TEACHERS UNION'S USE OF SCHOOL MAILBOXES RESTRICTED

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — FIREFIGHTERS
California Department of Forestry Firefighters C D F Firefighters and State Chip Away at Salary Compaction/187:61
State Cannot Add Terms to Arbitrator’s Contract Without Unions' Consent/186:77

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — HIGHER EDUCATION
Academic Professionals of California CSU Academic Support Professionals Disaffiliate From LIUNA/186:60
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Lowest Paid U.C. Employees in Line for Raises/184:70
U.C. Increases Wages for Custodians and Other Low-Paid Employees/185:47
California Faculty Association CFA Sues to End Executive Transition Perk/182:60
Court Overturns PERB’s Reading of CSU Arbitration Statute/187:45
CSU: Faculty Strike Looms as Factfinding Concludes/183:51
Factfinding Report Leads to New Faculty Contract/184:73
Two Bills Would Increase Oversight of California’s University System/186:56
California State University Employees Union CSU Staff Fume While Executives Average 11 Percent Raises/186:54
Coalition of University Employees Lowest Paid U.C. Employees in Line for Raises/184:70
U.C. Increases Wages for Custodians and Other Low-Paid Employees/185:47

EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS ACT (EERA)
Legislature Puts Self-Representation Back Into EERA/185:39

LABOR INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA
CSU Academic Support Professionals Disaffiliate From LIUNA/186:60
Society of Professional Scientists and Engineers, U P T E , Loc. 11 Lab's Skilled Crafts Workers Certified Under HEERA Days Before Transition to Private Sector/187:51

UNITED AUTO WORKERS, LOC. 4123
CSU Academic Student Employees Battle for Fee Waivers/185:43

U.C. STUDENT EMPLOYEES GAIN NEW BENEFITS

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL-AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
U.C. Hikes Faculty Salaries/186:58
University Professional and Technical Employees
Lowest Paid U.C. Employees in Line for Raises/184:70
U.C. and UPTE-CWA HX Reach Tentative Agreement/183:50
U.C.'s Increases Wages for Custodians and Other Low-Paid Employees/185:47
U.C.'s Health Care Workers Struggle to Have a Say in Pension Bargaining/182:63

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — LAW ENFORCEMENT
Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
County Can Force Use of Vacation Leave/186:35
California Statewide Law Enforcement Association
Safety Union Still Fighting for Pension Retroactivity/184:64
Rialto Police Benefit Association
Decision to Contract Out Law Enforcement Services Subject to Meet and Confer Duty Under MMBA/187:34
Riverside Sheriffs Association
Sheriffs Association Wins Attorney’s Fees in Bill of Rights Case/185:27
Sacramento County Alliance of Law Enforcement
Civil Service Commission Had Authority to Hear Appeal/185:35
Sacramento County Probation Association
Interest Arbitration Law Still Unconstitutional, Superior Court Judge Rules/183:37
Sacramento Police Officers Association
Decision to Hire Annuitants as Police Officers Is Policy Decision Outside Bargaining Duty/183:28
Supreme Court Depublishes Sacramento POA Decision/185:32
Statewide Law Enforcement Association
State Cannot Add Terms to Arbitrator’s Contract Without Union’s Consent/186:77
Ventura County Professional Peace Officers Association
Grievant Reinstated After Termination for Sexual Harassment/185:79

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
Sacramento’s Elimination of Retiree Medical Subsidy Faces Challenges/186:37
International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Loc. 21
Public Access to Information Expanded by High Court/186:75

International Union of Operating Engineers Stationary, Loc. 39
Action to Compel Arbitration Is Within PERB’s Exclusive Jurisdiction/185:24
Operating Engineers, Loc. 3
Appellate Court Hears Oral Argument in PERB Jurisdiction Cases/187:28
Sacramento County Attorney’s Association
Sacramento’s Elimination of Retiree Medical Subsidy Faces Challenges/186:37
Sacramento County Professional Accountants Association
Sacramento’s Elimination of Retiree Medical Subsidy Faces Challenges/186:37
Service Employees International Union, Loc. 535
Appellate Court Hears Oral Argument in PERB Jurisdiction Cases/187:28
Service Employees International Union, Loc. 660
Challenge to Local Decert Rule Barred/182:50
Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790
Contractual Notice Requirement Denied in City’s Jail Closure/187:76
Service Employees International Union, Loc. 817
Conflicts in Evidence Result in Reinstatement of Grievant/184:92
Teamsters, Loc. 150
Sacramento’s Elimination of Retiree Medical Subsidy Faces Challenges/186:37
Teamsters, Loc. 952
Governor Gets Cooling-Off Period in Orange County Transit Strike/184:5
United Public Employees, Loc. 1
Sacramento’s Elimination of Retiree Medical Subsidy Faces Challenges/186:37

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Association
Classifying Teachers as Temporary Employees Based Only on Certification Invalid/182:41
California School Employees Association
Allegations of Attempted Poisoning Unfounded, Skelly Violations Abound/182:76
Five-Day Limit to Request Hearing Violates Due Process/184:40
California Teachers Association
Federal Laws Preempt Parties’ Agreement When Special Education Student Is Involved/183:84
Teachers Serving Under Provisional Credentials Are Probationary Employees Entitled to Rights/184:42
Teachers Union’s Use of School Mailboxes Restricted/186:28

Diablo Valley College Faculty Senate
Community College’s Administrative Reorganization Does Not Require Consultation With Faculty Senate/184:35

El Centro Elementary Teachers Association
Contract Violation Regarding Permissive Subject of Bargaining Not Unfair Practice/182:71

Hayward Education Association
Hayward Teachers Get Contract After 10-Day Strike/184:34

San Leandro Teachers Association
Teachers Union’s Use of School Mailboxes Restricted/186:28

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 99
LAUSD Extends Health Benefits to Part-Time Cafeteria Workers/186:33

United Faculty
No Need to Exhaust CBA Remedies Before Filing FEHA Lawsuit/187:65

United Teachers-Los Angeles
LAUSD and UTLA Agree on Contract/183:43
Los Angeles USD Claims Payroll Problems Are Fixed/187:42
UTLA Schedules Strike Vote/182:38

United Teachers of Richmond
West Contra Costa Teachers Vote to Strike/185:41

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — STATE

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
State Forced to Raise Pay in Mental Hospitals/185:53

Association of California State Supervisors
Elected and Appointed Officials’ Salaries Jump/185:58

California Association of Highway Patrolmen
State Cannot Add Terms to Arbitrator’s Contract Without Unions’ Consent/186:77

California Association of Professional Scientists
CAPS’ Efforts to Raise Salaries Stymied/187:63
Everybody Wants Pay Parity/186:50
First Steps Taken to Modernize State Civil Service Hiring/185:55

California Association of Psychiatric Technicians
CAPT’s Pay Raise Prediction Borne Out/182:58

Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Receiver Points to SPB as Obstacle in Prison Reform/182:55

Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CDF Firefighters and State Chip Away at Salary Compaction/187:61

Department of Personnel Administration
CAPS’ Efforts to Raise Salaries Stymied/187:63
DPA Declares Impasse in C CPOA Talks/184:57
Safety Union Still Fighting for Pension Retroactivity/184:64

Department of Transportation
Supreme Court Bats Down Another PECG Attempt to Skirt Prop. 35/187:55

Legislative Analysts Office
LAO’s Compensation Recommendations Include Limiting Arbitrator Remedies and Ending Formulas/183:64
State Personnel Board
Lying by State Employees in an Investigation Is a Separate Act With Its Own Deadline for Discipline/183:57
Quasi-Judicial SPB Whistleblower Findings Must Be Challenged by Writ of Administrative Mandate Before Suit/183:67
Receiver Points to SPB as Obstacle in Prison Reform/182:55
SPB, as State Agency, Is Subject to Prohibition on Unfair Practices/182:51

California, University of (U.C.)
Lab’s Skilled Crafts Workers Certified Under HEERA Days Before Transition to Private Sector/187:51
Legislative Update/187:53
Lowest Paid U.C. Employees in Line for Raises/184:70
No Retaliation Where Doctor Discharged for Insubordination/182:73
Scrutiny of U.C. Retirement System Continues/185:45
Two Bills Would Increase Oversight of California’s Public Universities/186:56
U.C. and UPTÉ-CWA HX Reach Tentative Agreement/183:50
U.C. Hikes Faculty Salaries/186:58
U.C. Increases Wages for Custodians and Other Low-Paid Employees/185:47
U.C. Labor Studies’ Funding Up in the Air Again/182:65
U.C. Student Employees Gain New Benefits/187:48
U.C.’s Health Care Workers Struggle to Have a Say in Pension Bargaining/182:63

California State University (CSU)
CFA Sues to End Executive Transition Perk/182:60
Court Overturns PERB’s Reading of CSU Arbitration Statute/187:45
CSU: Faculty Strike Looms as Factfinding Concludes/183:51
CSU Academic Student Employees Battle for Fee Waivers/185:43
CSU Academic Support Professionals Disaffiliate From LIUNA/186:60
CSU Staff Fume While Executives Average 11 Percent Raises/186:54
Factfinding Report Leads to New Faculty Contract/184:73
If Signed, Legislation Would Boost Benefits for CSU Employees and Retirees/186:61
Legislative Update/187:53
Two Bills Would Increase Oversight of California’s Public Universities/186:56
Whistleblower Must File Petition for Writ of Mandate to Test if CSU ‘Satisfactorily Addressed’ Complaint/184:66

Cities
Chula Vista
Pitchess Motion Denied in Search and Seizure Case/185:33

Corvina
Routine Discussion With Supervisor Did Not Warrant Bill of Rights’ Protections/182:46

Los Angeles
Discharge Rejected for Misconduct That Occurred Two Years Prior to Administrative Complaint/186:39
Failure to Raise Statute of Limitations Claim at Board of Rights Forfeits Defense/187:32
No Due Process Violation Where ‘Skelly’ Officer Investigated Employee Misconduct/183:34

Oakland
Contractual Notice Requirement Denied in City’s Jail Closure/187:76
Public Access to Information Expanded by High Court/186:75

Rialto
Decision to Contract Out Law Enforcement Services Subject to Meet and Confer Duty Under MMBA/187:34

Sacramento
Decision to Hire Annuitants as Police Officers Is Policy Decision Outside Bargaining Duty/183:28
Supreme Court Depublishes Sacramento POA Decision/185:32

San Francisco
Action to Compel Arbitration Is Within PERB’s Exclusive Jurisdiction/185:24
Exceptions to PSO PBRA’s Limitations Period Scrutinized in Appellate Court Rulings/182:42
Public Lawyers’ Salary Survey Available/182:44

San Jose
Appellate Court Hears Oral Argument in PERB Jurisdiction Cases/187:28

Santa Barbara
Workers’ Comp Antidiscrimination Law Violated by City Policy/184:54

Counties
Contra Costa
Public Lawyers’ Salary Survey Available/182:44

Fresno
Public Lawyers’ Salary Survey Available/182:44

Los Angeles
County Can Force Use of Vacation Leave/186:35
Involuntary Transfer Based on Deficient Performance Not Punitive Absent Reduction in Pay, Rank/184:51
Public Lawyers’ Salary Survey Available/182:44
Monterey
Conflicts in Evidence Result in Reinstatement of Grievant/184:92

Orange
Adverse Arbitration Award Does Not Bar Statutory Claims/187:36
Challenge to Local Decert Rule Barred/182:50
Governor Gets Cooling-Off Period in Orange County Transit Strike/184:5
Public Lawyers' Salary Survey Available/182:44

Riverside
Public Lawyers' Salary Survey Available/182:44
Sheriffs Association Wins Attorney's Fees in Bill of Rights Case/185:27

Sacramento
Civil Service Commission Had Authority to Hear Appeal/185:35
Interest Arbitration Law Still Unconstitutional, Superior Court Judge Rules/183:37
Public Lawyers' Salary Survey Available/182:44
Sacramento's Elimination of Retiree Medical Subsidy Faces Challenges/186:37

San Diego
Commission's Reduction of Discipline Was Abuse of Discretion/184:55
Public Lawyers' Salary Survey Available/182:44

San Francisco
Action to Compel Arbitration Is Within PERB's Exclusive Jurisdiction/185:24
Exceptions to PSOPBRA's Limitations Period Scrutinized in Appellate Court Rulings/182:42
Public Lawyers' Salary Survey Available/182:44

Santa Clara
Appellate Court hears Oral Argument in PERB Jurisdiction Cases/187:28
Public Employees May 'Stand Mute' in Interrogations Absent Immunity Grant (Carol Vendrillo)/182:27
Public Lawyers' Salary Survey Available/182:44

Ventura
Grievant Reinstated After Termination for Sexual Harassment/185:79

Courts
Going Into Labor: The Birth of Trial Courts as Employers (Tula Bogdanos and Dena Graff)/182:5

School and Community College Districts
Antelope Valley CCD
Equitable Tolling Applicable to Time Limit for FEHA Claims/185:70

Atwater ESD
Four-Year Evidence Bar Not Absolute in Proceeding to Dismiss Teacher Accused of Sexual Misconduct/185:37

Bakersfield City SD
Classifying Teachers as Temporary Employees Based Only on Certification Invalid/182:41

Contra Costa CCD
Community College's Administrative Reorganization Does Not Require Consultation With Faculty Senate/184:35
No Need to Exhaust CBA Remedies Before Filing FEHA Lawsuit/187:65

El Centro ESD
Contract Violation Regarding Permissive Subject of Bargaining Not Unfair Practice/182:71

Escondido UH SD
Teacher's Termination Not Prohibited by Law or Contrary to Public Policy/184:46

Hayward USD
Hayward Teachers Get Contract After 10-Day Strike/184:34

Livingston USD
Five-Day Limit to Request Hearing Violates Due Process/184:40

Los Angeles USD
LAUSD and UTLA Agree on Contract/183:43
LAUSD Extends Health Benefits to Part-Time Cafeteria Workers/186:33
Los Angeles USD Claims Payroll Problems Are Fixed/187:42
No Appealable Demotion for Reduction of Employee Work Responsibilities/185:29
No Invasion of Privacy or Defamation Where Principal Criticized in the Press/184:87
Villaraigosa's Bill to Take Over L.A. Schools Ruled Unconstitutional/184:30
Villaraigosa's Plan to Reform LAUSD Runs Into Roadblocks/182:35

Oakland USD
Governor Vetoes Bill to return Oakland USD to Local Control/187:40
Oakland Inches Back Toward Local Control/185:41

Sacramento City USD
Notice of Probationary Release Untimely: Teacher Re-elected/184:38

San Francisco CCD
Calculation of Full-Time Assignment Dependent on District Practice/183:45

San Leandro USD
Federal Laws Preempt Parties' Agreement When Special Education Student Is Involved/183:84
Stockton USD
Allegations of Attempted Poisoning Unfounded, Skelly Violations Abound/182:76

Tustin USD
School District May Not Deduct Existing Employee’s Salary From Absent Employee’s Pay/183:47

Vallejo City USD
Teachers Serving Under Provisional Credentials Are Probationary Employees Entitled to Rights/184:42

West Contra Costa County USD
West Contra Costa Teachers Vote to Strike/185:41

EQUAL PAY ACT
Court Rejects Wage Discrimination Claim by Female Attorney/183:78

EQUAL PROTECTION IN EMPLOYMENT
Class-of-One Equal Protection Claim Inapplicable to Public Employer/183:73

EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES
No Need to Exhaust CBA Remedies Before Filing FEHA Lawsuit/187:65

FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (FEHA)
California Supreme Court Agrees to Hear FEHA Equitable Tolling Case/186:66
California Supreme Court Makes It Harder for Disabled Employees to Prove Discrimination/186:62
Court Finds Insufficient Evidence to Support Finding of Harassment/182:68
Court Rejects Wage Discrimination Claim by Female Attorney/183:78
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Employers, California Public — School and Community College Districts
Public Schools — General
Calculation of Full-Time Assignment Dependent on District Practice/183:45
California Unlikely to Meet Federal Deadlines for Qualified Teachers/182:38
Change to No Child Left Behind Act Under Consideration/186:27
Classifying Teachers as Temporary Employees Based Only on Certification Invalid/182:41
Four-Year Evidence Bar Not Absolute in Proceeding to Dismiss Teacher Accused of Sexual Misconduct/185:37
Teacher's Termination Not Prohibited by Law or Contrary to Public Policy/184:46
Teachers' Salaries Hit Relative Low-Point/182:39
Teachers Serving Under Provisional Credentials Are Probationary Employees Entitled to Rights/184:42
Teachers Union's Use of School Mailboxes Restricted/186:28
Year-Long Study Finds California Schools Have Big Problems/183:39

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES
Classifying Teachers as Temporary Employees Based Only on Certification Invalid/182:41

TENURE
Year-Long Study Finds California Schools Have Big Problems/183:39

TERMINATION
See also Discipline and Discharge
Due Process
Calculation of Full-Time Assignment Dependent on District Practice/183:45
Five-Day Limit to Request Hearing Violates Due Process/184:40
Four-Year Evidence Bar Not Absolute in Proceeding to Dismiss Teacher Accused of Sexual Misconduct/185:37
Teacher's Termination Not Prohibited by Law or Contrary to Public Policy/184:46

TITLE VII
Employer Vicariously Liable for Employee's Sexual Harassment/186:69
Schwarzenegger Vetoes Bill to Counteract Ledbetter/187:68
Supreme Court Interprets Time Limit Narrowly in Pay Discrimination Case/185:61
Union Violates Duty of Fair Representation and Title VII/187:70

TRANSIT
Governor Gets Cooling-Off Period in Orange County Transit Strike/184:5

TRANSFERS
see Discipline and Discharge

TRIAL COURT EMPLOYEES
see Court Employees
UNFAIR PRACTICES (IN GENERAL)
See rulings under Public Employment Relations Board and separate subject headings for specific unfair practice issues:

- Duty of Fair Representation
- Duty to Bargain (Meet and Confer) In Good Faith
- Scope of Bargaining
- Unilateral Change

UNILATERAL ACTION
see
- Duty to Bargain (Meet and Confer) In Good Faith
- Scope of Bargaining

UNILATERAL CHANGE
Contract Violation Regarding Permissive Subject of Bargaining Not Unfair Practice/182:71

UNIONS
Teachers Union’s Use of School Mailboxes Restricted/186:28

UNION MEMBERSHIP
Overall Union Membership Declines — Again/183:82

UNION SECURITY
see
- Agency Shop, Other Organizational Security, and Dues Deduction

UNIT DETERMINATION OR MODIFICATION
see
- Public Employment Relations Board — Representation Rulings
- Representation Elections, Recognition, and Decertification Proceedings

UNIVERSITIES
see
- Employers, California Public
  - California, University of
  - California State University

VACATION, ANNUAL LEAVE
see
- Pay and Benefits

WAGES AND BENEFITS
see
- Pay and Benefits

WHISTLEBLOWERS
Quasi-Judicial SPB Whistleblower Findings Must Be Challenged by Writ of Administrative Mandate Before Suit/183:67

W Whistleblower Must File Petition for Writ of Mandate to Test if CSU ‘Satisfactorily Addressed’ Complaint/184:66

WORKERS’ COMPENSATION
No CHP Chiefs Prosecuted for Workers’ Compensation Disability Retirement Fraud/183:59

Workers’ Comp Antidiscrimination Law Violated by City Policy/184:54

WRONGFUL DISCHARGE
Employee’s Reports of Physical Threats State Public Policy for Wrongful Discharge Claim/185:73

Wrongfully Terminated Disabled Employee Not Entitled to Backpay/185:76
A

All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Validity of the California Pension Obligations to be Issued

see State of California ex rel. Pension Obligation Bond Committee v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Validity of the California Pension Obligations to be Issued

Andersen v. Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board and City of Santa Barbara
The city violated antidiscrimination provisions of workers’ compensation law by requiring employees who sustain industrial injuries to use vacation leave when they obtain medical care for those injuries, while permitting workers who suffer non-industrial injuries to use sick leave for their medical appointments. Local governments and unions have the plenary power to provide sick leave, however, they may not create policies that discriminate against industrially injured employees.


Antelope Valley Community College Dist.

see McDonald v. Antelope Valley Community College Dist.

The district’s policy of classifying teachers and counselors solely on the basis of their certification is invalid. A teacher’s classification must be differentiated from his or her certification, and the district’s policy of making the employee’s classification dependent on his or her certification violated the Education Code. The district may classify as temporary employees “only those persons who, by virtue of the position they occupy or the manner of service they perform, are defined or described as temporary employees in the Education Code.”


Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs v. County of Los Angeles
To avoid paying a year-end cash-out payment, the county can force peace officers to use excess deferred vacation time. The officers did not enjoy an unconditional right to a cash payout because the county retained the right to order them to use the deferred hours by the end of the deferral year.


Beck v. United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Loc. 99
The union breached its duty of fair representation and discriminated against her on the basis of sex when it failed to pursue grievances that were filed to challenge

Atwater Elementary School Dist. v. California Department of General Services
Education Code Sec. 44944(a) provides that credentialed teachers may be disciplined by a school district for certain behavior occurring less than four years prior to the filing of a notice of intent to discipline. The court determined that the four-year limitation period is subject to equitable principles and is, therefore, not absolute.

(2007) 41 Cal.4th 227/185:37

B

Bakersfield City School Dist.

see Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Bakersfield City School Dist.

The district’s policy of classifying teachers and counselors solely on the basis of their certification is invalid. A teacher’s classification must be differentiated from his or her certification, and the district’s policy of making the employee’s classification dependent on his or her certification violated the Education Code. The district may classify as temporary employees “only those persons who, by virtue of the position they occupy or the manner of service they perform, are defined or described as temporary employees in the Education Code.”


Beck v. United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Loc. 99
The union breached its duty of fair representation and discriminated against her on the basis of sex when it failed to pursue grievances that were filed to challenge
disciplinary actions imposed for her use of profanity.
(2007) 506 F.3d 874/187:70

Benach v. County of Los Angeles
The Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act does not constrain a law enforcement agency from transferring an employee to compensate for his deficient performance. Based on evidence that the transfer was not punitive in nature and that the officer suffered no downgrade in rank or loss of pay, the reassignment did not trigger Bill of Rights Act protections.
(certified for publication 4-13-07) 149 C.4th 836/184:51

Berumen v. County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
The county's reduction of an employee's work-related job responsibilities was not a demotion under the county civil service rules.

Bettencourt et al. v. City and County of San Francisco
Disciplinary charges against police officers were timely filed under the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act because the limitations period was tolled during the pendency of a civil action where the officers all were named as defendants.
(2007) 146 C.4th 1090/182:42

Board of Trustees of the California State University
Ohtton v. Board of Trustees of the California State University

Board of Trustees of the California State University v. Public Employment Relations Board; California Faculty Assn.
Although academic employees at CSU are entitled to a final arbitration decision on grievances concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the law does not set unlimited remedial authority as a minimum statutory right that cannot be superseded by a collective bargaining agreement. The opinion overturns Trustees of the California State University (2006) Dec. No. 1823-H, 177 CPER 45, in which PERB found the university had engaged in an unfair practice by insisting to impasse on a proposal that limited the scope of the arbitrator's authority.
(2007) 155 C.4th 866/187:45

Breslin et al. v. City and County of San Francisco
Disciplinary charges filed against four San Francisco police officers were untimely under the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act because the matter did not involve a multi-jurisdictional or multiple-employee investigation.
(2007) 146 C.4th 1064/182:42

California Correctional Peace Officers Assn.
see Department of Personnel Administration v. California Correctional Peace Officers Assn.

California Department of Corrections v. California State Personnel Board
Contrary to Alameida v. State Personnel Board (2004) 120 Cal.App.4th 46, 167 CPER 61, which held that lying about alleged misconduct during an investigation “merged” with the underlying misconduct, state employees may be disciplined for dishonest denials of misconduct even if the state is barred by the statute of limitations from disciplining the employees for the conduct it was investigating.
(2007) 147 C.4th 797/183:57

California Department of General Services
Atwater Elementary School Dist. v. California Department of General Services

California Faculty Assn.
Board of Trustees of the California State University v. Public Employment Relations Board; California Faculty Assn.

California Portland Cement Co.
Faust v. California Portland Cement Co.

California School Employees Assn. v. Livingston Union School Dist.
A school district employee was denied due process when his request for a hearing on his termination was denied
because it was made more than five days after the notice of his right to a hearing was mailed. Due process requirements must be based on an evaluation of the totality of the circumstances in each situation. Here, the notice was sent during summer vacation, when the teacher was not at work. Because in-person delivery was precluded, the school could not maintain that service was completed upon mailing.


California School Employees Assn. v. Tustin Unified School Dist.
Education Code Sec. 45196 permits a school district to deduct the salary of a temporarily disabled classified employee and use it to pay the substitute employee hired to fill the position. However, the district may not deduct the salary if the substitute is a currently employed, classified employee assigned to the absent employee's hours or tasks.


California State Personnel Board
See California Department of Corrections v. California State Personnel Board
Valenzuela v. California State Personnel Board (Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation)

California Teachers Assn. v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist.
Teachers serving under provisional credentials are probationary employees entitled to statutory rights to notice and a pre-termination hearing when dismissed for economic reasons.


The school district was permitted to terminate a probationary teacher who, while employed at another district, informed the athletic director that a football coach had recommended a nutritional supplement to a student. The termination was not wrongful because it did not violate any well-established public policy or law.


Chrisman v. City of Los Angeles
A police officer was improperly terminated for misusing his department computer because the board of rights based its decision on misconduct that occurred outside the two-year statute of limitations period. The board erroneously determined that the officer's actions were criminal in nature, and therefore subject to a three-year limitations period. While the officer's computer inquiries were not initiated for any legitimate job-related purpose, he still was acting within the scope of his employment.


City and County of San Francisco
See Bettencourt et al. v. City and County of San Francisco
Breslin et al. v. City and County of San Francisco

City and County of San Francisco v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39
Section 3509 of the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act conveys to the Public Employment Relations Board exclusive jurisdiction to decide whether the exclusive representative of city employees is required to participate in the interest arbitration procedure authorized by the city charter.


City of Chula Vista Police Dept., RPI
See Giovanni v. Superior Court of San Diego County; City of Chula Vista Police Dept., RPI

City of Covina
See Steinert v. City of Covina

City of Los Angeles
See Chrisman v. City of Los Angeles
Moore v. City of Los Angeles

City of Rialto; County of San Bernardino, RPI
See Rialto Police Benefit Assn. v. City of Rialto; County of San Bernardino, RPI

City of Sacramento
See Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento
City of San Jose v. Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3
The superior court ruled that the city was required to seek injunctive relief from the Public Employment Relations Board for a planned strike. The city appealed that ruling to the Sixth District.

Cloverdale Unified School Dist.
See Gately v. Cloverdale Unified School Dist.

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training v. Superior Court
Information in a state database containing officers’ names, employing departments, and hiring and termination dates is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act.
(2007) 42 Cal.4th 278

Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of California v. Professional Engineers in California Government
An MOU provision designed to preserve the work of state engineers and architects violates Article XXII of the state Constitution, which exempts architectural and engineering services from the general civil service limitations on contracting out work performed by civil service employees. The legislature violated Article XXII when it approved the MOU between the state and PECG.
(2007) 42 Cal.4th 578

Contra Costa Community College Dist.
See Diablo Valley College Faculty Senate v. Contra Costa Community College Dist.
Ortega v. Contra Costa Community College Dist.

County of Los Angeles
See Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs v. County of Los Angeles
Benach v. County of Los Angeles
Frank v. County of Los Angeles
Hall v. County of Los Angeles

County of Orange
See Marcario v. County of Orange

County of Riverside
See Riverside Sheriff’s Assn. v. County of Riverside

County of Sacramento
See Sacramento County Alliance of Law Enforcement v. County of Sacramento

County of Santa Clara
See Spielbauer v. County of Santa Clara

County of Santa Clara v. Service Employees International Union Local 535
The superior ruled that the county was not required to seek injunctive relief from the Public Employment Relations Board, but was free to obtain an injunction from the court. SEIU appealed this ruling.

Craig v. M&O Agencies, Inc.
The court overturned the lower court’s dismissal of a complaint brought by an employee who had been sexually harassed by her direct supervisor. The employer’s affirmative defense to an employee’s sexual harassment charge failed because it could not show that the employee had “unreasonably failed to take advantage of any preventive or corrective opportunities provided by the employer.”
(2007) 496 F.3d 1047

The court upheld a Washington state law that required public sector unions to obtain individual nonmembers’ affirmative authorization to use their agency fees for political contributions. The union had no constitutional right to agency fees, and the “modest limitation” imposed by the state law did not violate the First Amendment.
(6-14-07) ___ U.S. ___, 127 S.Ct. 2372

Davis v. Los Angeles Unified School District Personnel Commission
A wrongfully demoted school district employee who was on disability leave for reasons unrelated to his employment is not entitled to full backpay or immediate reinstatement.
Davis v. O’Melveny & Myers
An arbitration agreement between a paralegal and her former employer was both procedurally and substantively unconscionable because the agreement was distributed to employees on a “take it or leave it” basis.

Department of Personnel Administration v. California Correctional Peace Officers Assn.
Although an arbitrator had evidence that the MOU between DPA and CCPOA did not reflect the parties’ intent, she exceeded her powers under the Dills Act when she rewrote the contract to incorporate the parties’ intent. Since the act requires legislative approval of any terms requiring expenditure of funds, and the arbitrator’s reformation of the contract had significant fiscal consequences, her award violated “the important public policy of legislative oversight of employee contracts.”

Diablo Valley College Faculty Senate v. Contra Costa Community College Dist.
The president of a community college is not required to consult with the faculty before moving the management of academic divisions from faculty members to full-time professional administrators.

Engquist v. Oregon Department of Agriculture
The class-of-one theory of equal protection is inapplicable to workplace decisions made by public employers.
(2007) 478 F.3d. 985/183:73

Escondido Union High School Dist.
see Carter v. Escondido Union High School Dist.

Faust v. California Portland Cement Co.
An employee who provided sufficient information to advise his employer of his need for leave under the California Family Rights Act was entitled to notice of his right to take such leave before being terminated.

Flippin v. Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners; Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power, RPI
Due process principles do not prohibit a manager who initiated disciplinary action against an employee from presiding over that employee’s Skelly hearing, especially when the employee is afforded a full evidentiary hearing before a neutral hearing examiner appointed by the civil service commission. And, where the weight of the evidence supported the charges levied against the employee, the trial court erred when it rejected the penalty of discharge that had been ordered by the commission.

Frank v. County of Los Angeles
Because the county had not erected racial barriers to deter minorities from applying for the position of county sheriff, there was no actionable disparate impact. The fact that most of the county police officers were minorities and paid less than the county sheriffs, who were mostly white, did not make the police officers a protected group, the court concluded.

Franklin v. The Monadnock Co.
Public policy precluded the employer from terminating an employee in retaliation for reporting physical threats against himself and other employees in the workplace. Public policy demands that the workplace be a crime-free and safe environment and that employees should be able to report threats of violence voiced by coworkers without fear of losing their jobs.

Gately v. Cloverdale Unified School Dist.
Under the Education Code, a classified employee becomes a senior management employee only when the school board so designates. Absent that designation, the district’s business manager was not entitled to have her employment contract renewed.

Genest
see Teachers’ Retirement Board v. Genest
**Giovanni v. Superior Court of San Diego County; City of Chula Vista Police Dept., RPI**

A minor’s Pitchess motion seeking in camera review of arresting officers’ confidential personnel records was properly denied because the requested discovery was irrelevant to the minor’s defense that he had been improperly detained and searched. The officers had an objectively reasonable basis to place the minor in custody, and the Pitchess motion fell short of articulating how the officers’ veracity would undermine the validity of the search and seizure.

(5-30-07, certified for publication 6-21-07) 152 Cal.App.4th 312/185:33

**Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.**

See **Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.**

**Google, Inc.**

See **Reid v. Google, Inc.**

**Governing Board of the San Leandro Unified School Dist.**

See **San Leandro Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board of the San Leandro Unified School Dist.**

**Green v. State of California**

An employee claiming disability discrimination in violation of California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act bears the burden of proving he is a “qualified individual with a disability” or capable of performing the essential functions of the job with or without reasonable accommodation. The legislature intended the FEHA to require the same burden of proof as the federal Americans with Disabilities Act.

(2007) 42 Cal.4th 254/186:62

**Hall v. County of Los Angeles**

The court found no discrimination in a class action case in which female attorneys hired by the county to represent juveniles claimed that they were being paid less than male attorneys doing the same work.


**Hoschler v. Sacramento City Unified School Dist.**

Under California Ed. Code Sec. 44929.21, when a school district with 250 or more students determines not to reelect an employee on probationary status, it must notify the employee of its decision prior to March 15 by personal service or some other equivalent method. If it fails to do so, the employee is deemed reelected for the following school year. Although the statute does not specify the method for providing the required service, the presumption of personal service applies.


**International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Loc. 21 v. Superior Court**

Names and salaries of public employees, including peace officers, are subject to disclosure and not protected under the California Public Records Act.

(2007) 42 Cal.4th 319/187:21

**International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39**

See **City and County of San Francisco v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39**

**Kempton**

See **Professional Engineers in California Government v. Kempton**

**Kenneth Cole Productions**

See **Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions**

**Kern County Employees Retirement Assn.**

See **Pellerin v. Kern County Employees Retirement Assn.**

**King v. United Parcel Service, Inc.**

A discharged employee’s complaint of disability discrimination and failure to provide reasonable accommodation in violation of California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act was dismissed because the employee failed to provide sufficient evidence that he was terminated because of his disability. The court also dismissed the claim that the employer had failed to provide reasonable accommodation because the employee failed to specifically request a modified work schedule.

Kolender v. San Diego County Civil Service Commission; Gant, RPI
The San Diego County Civil Service Commission abused its discretion when it reduced the disciplinary action that had been imposed on a detention processing technician by the county sheriff. The commission singled out the technician’s inaccurate evaluation rating without giving appropriate consideration to the considerable enumerated areas in which she was deficient and failed to give adequate weight to the sheriff’s concerns for public safety.
(certified for publication 4-6-07) 149 Cal.App.4th 464/184:55

Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
Administrative complaints alleging pay discrimination must be filed within the charging period — 180 days after the last pay decision that demonstrated discriminatory intent, or within 300 days in states with agencies authorized to accept Title VII charges — not within 180 or 300 days of the issuance of the last paycheck that reflects the discriminatory activity. The court’s majority rejected the theory, adopted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, that each paycheck reflected the adverse effects of past discrimination and thus constituted a new violation. It explicitly refused to extend to claims of pay discrimination the rationale applied to hostile work environment claims in National Railroad Passenger Corp. v. Morgan (2002) 536 U.S. 101, 155 CPER 70.

Livingston Union School Dist.
see California School Employees Assn. v. Livingston Union School Dist.

Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners; Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power, RPI
see Flippin v. Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners; Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power, RPI

Los Angeles City Fire Dept.
see Malais v. Los Angeles City Fire Dept.

Los Angeles Unified School Dist.
see Morrow v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.

Los Angeles Unified School District Personnel Commission
see Davis v. Los Angeles Unified School District Personnel Commission

M & O Agencies, Inc.
see Craig v. M & O Agencies, Inc.

Malais v. Los Angeles City Fire Dept.
There was no disability discrimination where a disabled fire captain was refused the command of a fire station but offered other positions with comparable pay and promotion opportunities. 

Marcario v. County of Orange
An Orange County employee who unsuccessfully challenged her reassignment and demotion before an arbitrator under the terms of an MOU is not barred from bringing statutory claims for workplace retaliation in violation of the Labor Code, intentional infliction of emotional distress, or violations of her federal civil rights. The arbitration of a labor grievance cannot have binding effect against an employee’s statutory claims unless the agreement expressly so states. The statute of limitations applicable to her statutory claims are tolled during the time she pursued the internal grievance procedure.

McDonald v. Antelope Valley Community College Dist.
The doctrine of equitable tolling applies to the one-year statutory time limit for the filing of administrative complaints of discrimination under California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act. The time for filing a claim with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing can, in the proper circumstance, be tolled while the complainant pursues internal remedies with her employer.
McDonald v. Antelope Valley Community College District
The California Supreme Court will decide whether equitable tolling applies to extend the one-year administrative filing requirement under the state's Fair Employment and Housing Act. The Court of Appeal determined the rule applied where a library technician's assistant did not file her FEHA complaint with the administrative agency within the one-year period but instead filed an internal complaint.

McKesson HBOC
see Roby v. McKesson HBOC

Mendoza v. State of California
The court struck down A.B. 1381, known as the Romero Act, which would have provided for a Council of Mayors to participate in the selection of the superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District and have an advisory role in determining the budget. It also would have given the mayor direct control over three high schools and their feeder schools through an entity called the Mayor's Partnership.

Moore v. City of Los Angeles
A police officer unsuccessfully challenged his removal from the force because he failed to raise his statute of limitations defense before the board of rights. The court clarified that the officer could have invoked the trial court's initial jurisdiction to remedy a perceived violation of the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act under Gov. Code Sec. 3309.5. But, having failed to take that action, the court concluded that the one-year statute of limitations defense could not be raised for the first time in a petition for a writ of administrative mandate under Code of Civil Procedure Sec. 1094.5 because there was no record on the timeliness issue for the court to review.

The court dismissed a school principal's invasion of privacy and defamation claims based on statements made to the press about his performance. The challenged statements were constitutionally protected and revealed no private information.

Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions
An additional hour of pay awarded to compensate an employee for denied meal or rest periods is a premium wage subject to the three-year statute of limitations period, not a penalty subject to a one-year limitations period.
(2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094/184:85

Nevada Dept. of Human Resources
see Walsh v. Nevada Dept. of Human Resources

Ohton v. Board of Trustees of the California State University
A provision of the California Whistleblower Protection Act applicable only to the California State University allows a “remedy” if CSU does not “satisfactorily address” the employee's administrative complaint.

O'Melveny & Myers
see Davis v. O'Melveny & Myers

Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3
see City of San Jose v. Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3

Opinion of Edmond G. Brown, Jr.
Under the Ralph M. Brown Act, a school superintendent may not prohibit an administrative employee of the district from attending or speaking at a public school board meeting. The A.G. determined that, under the Brown Act, Gov. Code Secs. 54950-54963, the superintendent could not prohibit the employee from either attending the board meeting or speaking on the agenda item.

Oregon Department of Agriculture
see Engquist v. Oregon Department of Agriculture
**Ortega v. Contra Costa Community College Dist.**

A public employee is not required to exhaust internal grievance procedures created by a collective bargaining agreement culminating in arbitration prior to bringing a lawsuit alleging violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act. The court distinguished the facts in this case from those in which courts have required administrative or judicial exhaustion.


**Pellerin v. Kern County Employees Retirement Assn.**

By operation of Gov. Code Sec. 31720.5, a firefighter who has completed more than five years of service and develops heart disease is entitled to a presumption that the medical condition arose out of and in the course of his employment. Therefore, absent evidence presented by the agency to rebut this presumption, he is entitled to disability retirement under Sec. 31720 as a matter of law.


**Poland v. Chertoff**

Where it can be shown that a biased subordinate influenced or was involved in an investigation of an employee that results in an adverse employment action, the subordinate's animus may be imputed to the employer.

(2007) 494 F.3d 1174/186:66

**Professional Engineers in California Government**

See **Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of California v. Professional Engineers in California Government**

**Professional Engineers in California Government v. Kempton**

The Supreme Court rejected PECG’s attempt to limit the effect of Proposition 35. Passed by the voters in 2000, the proposition exempted architectural and engineering services from the California Constitution’s restrictions on the use of private contractors for work performed by state civil service employees. The court held that several statutes governing Caltrans’ use of private contractors were implicitly repealed by the proposition, but it also upheld contractor selection procedures that the agency had used prior to Prop. 35.

(2007) 40 Cal.4th 1016/184:59

**Public Employment Relations Board; California Faculty Assn.**

See **Board of Trustees of the California State University v. Public Employment Relations Board; California Faculty Assn.**

**Regents of the University of California**

See **Sarka v. Regents of the University of California**

**Reid v. Google, Inc.**

The court overturned the trial court’s dismissal of a terminated employee’s claim of age discrimination. Google maintained that the 54-year-old employee had been fired because his job had been eliminated. But the court found that ageist remarks, statistical evidence, the employee’s demotion, and changed rationales for the termination together created a triable issue of fact that the company’s explanation for the dismissal was pretextual.


**Rialto Police Benefit Assn. v. City of Rialto; County of San Bernardino, RPI**

The city was required to meet and confer with the police benefit association before it entered into a contract with the county sheriff to provide law enforcement services. The court concluded that the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act required the city to bargain over the subcontracting decision itself because it was not a fundamental policy matter outside the bargaining obligation and because the implication of labor costs as a basis for the city’s decision favors resolution within the collective bargaining framework.


**Riverside Sheriff’s Assn. v. County of Riverside**

The court awarded attorney’s fees to the association where it was successful in enforcing its members’ rights to representation under the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. The appellate court announced that Sec. 3309.5(e) of the Bill of Rights Act, which authorizes a civil penalty of up to $25,000 and attorney’s fees for malicious violations of the act, does not foreclose an award of attorney’s fees under Code of Civil Procedure Sec. 1021.5 when a party has secured an important right of public interest.

Roby v. McKesson HBOC
The court overruled a jury's finding of hostile work environment and harassment under the Fair Employment and Housing Act. There was insufficient evidence to support the verdict on the harassment cause of action and the award of $1.1 million in non-economic damages, and millions more in punitive damages. The court upheld the jury's verdict for the plaintiff on other causes of action but modified the damages award.

Sacramento City Unified School Dist.
see Hoschler v. Sacramento City Unified School Dist.

Sacramento County Alliance of Law Enforcement v. County Sacramento
The Sacramento County Civil Service Commission had authority to hear an administrative appeal contesting a temporary civil service appointment. However, there was no merit to the claim that a civil service employee had been improperly passed over for two temporary work assignments.

Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento
The California Supreme Court depublished the appellate court ruling that the decision of the city police department to hire retirees as temporary officers to address a staffing shortage was a fundamental policy decision designed to maintain the existing level of public safety in the community. Relying on Claremont Police Officers Assn. v. City of Claremont (2006) 39 Cal.4th 623, 180 CPER 21, the Court of Appeal had held that the city's interest in unfettered decisionmaking was not outweighed by the benefit gained in subjecting the matter to the bargaining process.
/185:32

Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento
The proposal of the City of Sacramento Police Department to hire retirees as temporary, non-career employees to remedy a short-term staffing shortage was a fundamental managerial policy decision designed to maintain the existing level of public safety in the community. As such, it was not subject to the city's duty to meet and confer with the Sacramento Police Officers Association, even if the proposal represented a change in the terms and conditions of employment. Because implementation of the plan was not intended to affect employment terms, details of the plan were not subject to the duty to meet and confer imposed by the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act.

San Diego County Civil Service Commission; Gant, RPI
see Kolender v. San Diego County Civil Service Commission; Gant, RPI

Education Code Sec. 7054 prohibits teachers unions from distributing materials with political endorsements to school mailboxes. In so ruling, the appellate court overruled the trial court's decision and rehabilitated the Public Employment Relations Board's interpretation of the statute.

San Francisco Community College Dist.
see Womack v. San Francisco Community College Dist.

Sarka v. Regents of the University of California
A doctor employed at the University of California at Los Angeles student health center was discharged for insubordination, not because he was advocating for medically appropriate health care for his patients. The university did not violate Business and Professions Code Sec. 2056.

Service Employees International Union Local 535
see County of Santa Clara v. Service Employees International Union Local 535

Spielbauer v. County of Santa Clara
A public agency cannot penalize one of its employees for refusing to answer incriminating questions unless the employer first grants or offers the employee immunity. The Fifth Amendment constitutional privilege against compelled self-incrimination allows
a public employee to rightfully refuse to answer questions posed by his superiors unless the employer first grants the employee protection against the use of the compelled answers in any later criminal prosecution. (2007) 146 Cal.App.4th 914/182:27; review granted 5-9-07

State of California

see Green v. State of California
Mendoza v. State of California

State of California ex rel. Pension Obligation Bond Committee v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Validity of the California Pension Obligations to be Issued

The Pension Obligation Bond Committee could not persuade the court to validate its proposal to sell up to $960 million in bonds to fund the state’s contributions to the Public Employees Retirement System. Freeing up money by financing contributions to pension funds was found unconstitutional. (2007) 152 Cal.App.4th 1386/186:72

Steinert v. City of Covina

A conversation between a police officer and her commanding officer was a routine counseling session, not an interrogation leading to punitive action, and did not trigger the procedural protections conveyed by the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. At the time of the discussion, the sergeant had no intention of imposing any discipline on the officer and saw the exchange only as a training opportunity. (10-11-06; publication ordered by Supreme Court 1-3-07) 146 Cal.App.4th 458/182:46

Superior Court

see Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training v. Superior Court
Giovanni v. Superior Court of San Diego County; City of Chula Vista Police Dept., RPI
International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Loc. 21 v. Superior Court
State Board of Chiropractic Examiners v. Superior Court (Arbuckle)

Teachers’ Retirement Board v. Genest

The Teachers’ Retirement Board successfully challenged the state’s deferral of $500 million it owed to the Supplemental Benefit Maintenance Account of the Teachers’ Retirement Fund. Freeing up money by delaying contributions to pension funds was found unconstitutional. (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 1012/186:72

The Monadnock Co.

see Franklin v. The Monadnock Co.

Tustin Unified School Dist.

see CSEA v. Tustin Unified School Dist.

United Food and Commercial Workers Union, L.oc. 99

see Beck v. United Food and Commercial Workers Union, L.oc. 99

U.S. Marshals Service

see Walton v. U.S. Marshals Service

Valenzuela v. California State Personnel Board (Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation)

The State Personnel Board abused its discretion when it upheld the termination of a correctional officer who failed a drug test after taking diet pills prescribed by a Mexican doctor. There was insufficient evidence that the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation warned the officer not to take the medication because it could result in a positive drug test. (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 1179/186:51

Vallejo City Unified School Dist.

see California Teachers Assn. v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist.

Walsh v. Nevada Dept. of Human Resources

State and individual defendants are immune from liability for money damages for claims of employment discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The plaintiff did not have standing to request injunctive relief because she had left her employment and did not plan to return to the job. (2006) 471 F.3d 1033/182:66
Walton v. U.S. Marshals Service

A court security officer who was terminated because of a “significant” hearing impairment was not disabled within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. “In order to state a ‘regarded as’ claim a plaintiff must establish that the employer believes that the plaintiff has some impairment, and provide evidence that the employer subjectively believes that the plaintiff is substantially limited in a major life activity.”

(9th Cir. 2007) 476 F.3d 723/183:71

Washington Education Assn.
see Davenport v. Washington Education Assn.

Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board and City of Santa Barbara
see Andersen v. Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board and City of Santa Barbara
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Dills Act Cases

AFSCME Loc. 2620 v. Department of Personnel Administration, No. Ad-359-S/183:91
(The request to disqualify an ALJ from presiding over an administrative hearing was denied because it would not effectuate the purpose of the act.)

Burnett v. SEIU Loc. 1000, CSEA, No. 1914-S/186:92
(The union did not breach its duty of fair representation by failing to file an unfair practice charge on the charging party's behalf or by failing to inform him of the status of his grievance arbitration request.)

Dinkins v. SEIU Loc. 1000, CSEA, No. 1901-S/185:94
(The union's insistence that an employee resign as a union member in order to attain religious objector status does not violate the act.)

Horspool v. State of California [Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation], No. 1923-S/187:88
(The charging party's unfair practice charge was dismissed because all the underlying incidents occurred more than six months before the charge was filed, and Dills Act Sec. 3514.5(a)(1) prohibits PERB from issuing a complaint with respect to any charge based on alleged conduct that occurred more than six months prior to the filing of the charge.)

(SP B is subject to Dills Act Sec. 3519 and cannot interfere with an employee's exercise of rights under the act. SP B's adjudicatory authority does not insulate it from PERB review for the limited purpose of deciding an unfair practice dispute. However, because the act does not provide the right to submit settlement agreements to SP B through an unconstitutional MOU procedure, IUOE failed to establish a prima facie case of interference.)

Menaster v. Union of American Physicians & Dentists, No. 1918-S/186:93
(The union did not breach its duty of fair representation by failing to represent the charging party at an unemployment hearing because the duty does not exist in extra-contractual proceedings. Advising the charging party to resign instead of filing grievances alleging retaliatory conduct by the employer was not without rational basis or honest judgment.)

EERA Cases

Associated Administrators of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist., No. 1884/183:97
(The district violated EERA when it refused to bargain with the association regarding employees whom the board had previously determined to be bargaining unit members.)

(Because the charging party alleged only that his hours were reduced and that he was reprimanded for his
involvement in heated verbal confrontations with other employees, the charge was dismissed for failure to state a prima facie case.)

**Burlingame Elementary School Dist. v. CSEA, Order No. JR-24/183:98**
(Because the district did not present a unique issue of special importance, the board denied its request for judicial review.)

**California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 77 v. Lodi Unified School Dist., No. 1893/184:102**
(Although a district custodian engaged in protected activity, the evidence failed to demonstrate that district administrators made decisions affecting his employment because of that conduct.)

**California School Employers Assn. and its Chap. 169 v. Madera Unified School Dist., No. 1907/185:96**
(The district's change in contribution levels toward current and retired employees' health care benefits was not an unfair practice because the new levels were consistent with the terms of the collective bargaining agreement and past practice.)

**California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 407 v. Desert Community College Dist.), No. 1921/186:97**
(The district impermissibly interfered with the employees' and association's rights by threatening discipline or criminal prosecution for participants at a members-only on-campus meeting where an upcoming board of trustees election was to be discussed. Ed. Code Sec. 7054 prohibits the use of district funds, services, supplies, or equipment for the purpose of urging the support or defeat of any ballot measure or candidate, but does not apply to the use of district premises.)

**California School Employees Assn., Chaps. 759, 724, and 788 v. San Diego Unified School Dist., No. 1883/183:94**
(The district acted unlawfully when it failed to implement a two-tier leave accrual system without providing the union notice or an opportunity to negotiate.)

**Delano Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Delano Unified School Dist., No. 1908/185:97**
(Because the association failed to establish an unstable collective bargaining relationship, four allegations asserting unilateral policy changes were deferred to arbitration.)

(The board found that allowing the charging party to withdraw its charge was in the best interests of the party and consistent with the purposes of the act.)

**East Whittier City Elementary School Dist. v. East Whittier Administrators and Supervisors Assn., No. 1887/183:98**
(Because it was in the best interest of the parties and consistent with the purpose of EERA, the board granted the parties' request to vacate a proposed board agent decision.)

(The board lacks jurisdiction to issue an unfair practice complaint challenging a unilateral mid-term modification of a contract provision that is a permissive subject of bargaining.)

**Estacio v. Modesto City School Dist., No. 1873/182:89**
(Because it was untimely filed and did not state a prima facie case, the charge was dismissed.)

**Estacio et al. v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 007, No. 1874/182:90**
(Because it was untimely filed and did not state a prima facie case, the charge was dismissed.)

(The charging party's appeal was untimely filed.)

**Gillead v. United Educators of San Francisco, No. 1897/184:105**
(The union's decision to consolidate the charging party's individual grievance with a class action grievance contesting the same employer policies did not breach the duty of fair representation.)

**Gutierrez v. SEIU Loc. 99, No. 1899/185:100**
(PERB is prohibited from issuing an unfair practice complaint with respect to any charge based on an alleged unfair practice occurring more than six months prior to the filing of the charge.)

**Hesperia Education Assn., CTA/NEA v. Hesperia Unified School Dist., No. 1875/182:89**
(The request to withdraw exceptions to the ALJ's proposed decision was granted.)

**Jones v. SEIU, Loc. 99, No. 1882/183:100**
(The charging party failed to present evidence that SEIU acted without rational basis or honest judgment, and the duty of fair representation charge was dismissed.)
King City High School Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. King City Joint Union High School Dist., No. 1777a/183:99
Because the parties later discovered that the cost of complying with the board's order could bankrupt the school district, and because the parties reached a fair remedy to address the situation, the board granted the modification request.

Maaskant v. Kern High Faculty Assn., CTA/NEA, No. 1885/183:97
The charge alleging that the charging party was denied the opportunity to serve as a member of the association's representative council is an internal union affair into which PERB will not interfere unless there is an impact on the employer-employee relationship. Because no impact was shown, the charge was dismissed.

Mandell v. San Leandro Unified School Dist., N o. 1924/187:90
The charging party failed to demonstrate that his employment was terminated by the district in response to his protected activity. Instead, the district fired the charging party because it believed that he lacked the teaching credentials required for his employment.

The charging party's discovery of language in an R.A.'s dismissal letter that caused him “serious concern” does not warrant a finding of good cause to excuse the untimely filing of his appeal.

The district failed to meet and negotiate in good faith when during reopener negotiations, it refused to bargain over the selection of a health insurance carrier.

Oakland Education Assn. v. Oakland Unified School Dist., N o. 1880/183:93
The district's decision not to reelect a teacher was motivated by his protected activities; the district would not have made that choice but for his protected conduct. However, the district placed the teacher on administrative leave based on reasonable concerns about school safety.

Okeke v. United Teachers of Los Angeles, No. 1888/183:101
Because the union's actions were not arbitrary, discriminatory, or in bad faith, it did not breach its duty of fair representation and the charge was dismissed.

Pina v. Public Employees Union, Loc. 1, N o. 1872/182:90
Because the charging party failed to provide sufficient factual detail to state a prima facie case, the charge was dismissed.

The board granted the district's request to withdraw its exceptions and the association's request to withdraw its unfair practice charge with prejudice.

Santa Clara Unified School Dist. v. California Federation of Teachers; United Teachers of Santa Clara, CTA/NEA, No. 1911/186:101
The union's petition for recognition of an adult education teachers unit was granted because the teachers had a separate and distinct community of interest, and the board upheld an interpretation of EERA that allowed teachers from the same district to be a part of different unions.

Ulmschneider v. Los Banos Teachers Assn., No. 1922/187:93
The association did not breach its duty of fair representation where its decision not to pursue the charging party's grievance to arbitration was not arbitrary, discriminatory, or in bad faith.

Victor Valley College Faculty Assn., CTA/NEA v. Victor Valley Community College Dist., No. Ad-357/182:87
Because the parties mutually reached a settlement, the board granted the association's request to withdraw its unfair practice charge and vacate the decision issued by the ALJ.

Wyman v. California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 374, N o. 1903/185:100
The association's failure to obtain the charging party's signature and approval of a grievance, the untimely filing of a grievance, and the failure to schedule an informal conference did not breach the duty of fair representation.
### HEERA Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFSCME, Loc. 3299 v. University of California, N.o. 1869-H/182:93</td>
<td>(Because the parties settled their dispute, the board granted the parties' request for withdrawal.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball v. UTPE, CWA Loc. 9119, N.o. 1821a-H/183:104</td>
<td>(Because the motion to vacate was premised solely on a settlement agreement between the parties, the motion was denied. The motion to dismiss as moot was granted.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Employees Assn., CSU Div., and California Faculty Assn. v. California State University, N.o. 1876-H/182:94</td>
<td>(The university violated HEERA when it consulted an outside task force regarding matters within the scope of bargaining and when it failed to provide the union with requested information pertaining to a mandatory subject of bargaining. However, CSU had no obligation to bargain over the location of a parking structure.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University v. Academic Professionals of California and California State Employees Assn., N.o. 1881-H/183:102</td>
<td>(Proper bargaining unit placement of a new classification requires additional evidence relevant to the criteria set forth in Sec. 3579 to determine appropriate units under H E E R A.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University v. California State Employees Union and State Employees Trades Council-U nited, N.o. Ad-358-H/182:96</td>
<td>(Because the union withdrew its appeal, the board granted the withdrawal.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Employees Union v. California State University, N.o. 1886-H/183:104</td>
<td>(Because the condition placed on bargaining was within the parties' control, and because the university's communication with employees did not evidence a campaign to disparage the union, the case was dismissed.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemello v. California State University [Humboldt], N.o. 1866-H/182:92</td>
<td>(T he charge was dismissed because the employee untimely filed the unfair practice charge, lacked standing to file the charge, and failed to provide sufficient evidence to support a prima facie case.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemello v. State Employees Trades Council U nited, N.o. 1867-H/182:96</td>
<td>(Because the charge was not timely filed, and because the charging party was not entitled to union representation, the charge was dismissed.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition of University Employees, Loc. 6 v. University of California, N.o. 1870-H/182:93</td>
<td>(Because the union requested information pertaining to employees outside of its bargaining unit, the university did not violate H E E R A when it refused to provide the requested information.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis et al. v. UTPE, CWA Loc. 9119, N.o. 1817a-H/183:103</td>
<td>(Because the motion to vacate was premised solely on a settlement agreement between the parties, the motion was denied. The motion to dismiss as moot was granted.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley v. UTPE, CWA Loc. 919, N.o. 1818a-H/183:104</td>
<td>(Because the motion to vacate was premised solely on a settlement agreement between the parties, the motion was denied. The motion to dismiss as moot was granted.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez-Newby v. UTPE, CWA Loc. 9119, N.o. 1819a-H/183:104</td>
<td>(Because the motion to vacate was premised solely on a settlement agreement between the parties, the motion was denied. The motion to dismiss as moot was granted.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Employees Trades Council U nited v. Regents of the University of California, N.o. 1912-H/186:103</td>
<td>(The university's failure to recognize the charging party as the exclusive representative of a skilled crafts unit did not violate H E E R A, and the allegation concerning the mistaken deduction of union dues from employees in the proposed unit was untimely filed.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide University Police Assn. v. California State University, N.o. 1871-H/182:93</td>
<td>(Because the condition placed on bargaining was within the parties' control, and because the university's communication with employees did not evidence a campaign to disparage the union, the case was dismissed.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunder v. California Faculty Assn., N.o. 1889-H/183:105</td>
<td>(An association may decline to pursue arbitration unless the decision is arbitrary or discriminatory, or made in bad faith. Because the association made its decision in good faith and with a reasonable basis, the charge was dismissed.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yaron v. UTPE, CWA Loc. 9119, N.o. 1820a-H/183:104
(Because the motion to vacate was premised solely on a settlement agreement between the parties, the motion was denied. The motion to dismiss as moot was granted.)

---

**MMBA Cases**

Buck v. Amalgamated Transit Union, Loc. 1704, N.o. 1898-M/184:110
(The union breached its duty of fair representation by failing to file a timely grievance challenging an employee's termination where its failure to do so completely extinguished the employee's right to pursue his grievance.)

Chan v. SEIU Loc. 790, N.o. 1892-M/184:109
(The allegations did not demonstrate that the union's failure to seek arbitration concerning the charging party's termination was arbitrary, discriminatory, or motivated by bad faith.)

(The union's petition seeking severance of craft employees was dismissed because the union failed to prove that the city's unit determination decision was unreasonable.)

Health Care Workers Union Loc. 250 v. Sutter County In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority, N.o. 1900-M/185:101
(The decision to implement a criminal background check is a fundamental managerial policy outside the scope of bargaining, as are the effects of that decision, which are integral to the policy and primarily related to public safety. Effects that relate to traditional terms and conditions of employment are subject to the duty to bargain.)

(The board has no jurisdiction over the union's unfair practice charge because the transit district operates under a separate statutory scheme and is not subject to the MMBA.)

Jurupa Community Services District Employees Assn. v. Jurupa Community Services Dist., N.o. 1920-M/186:109
(The charging party established that the district engaged in retaliation by terminating him shortly after he filed a grievance. The district failed to prove that it would have terminated the grievant if he had not done so.)

Keymolent v. City of Santa Clarita, N.o. 1865-M/182:97
(Because PERB lacks jurisdiction over private employees, the charge filed by a private transit worker was dismissed.)

Langlois-Dul v. SEIU Loc. 715, N.o. 1917-M/186:114
(Because the board agent incorrectly addressed the warning letter informing the charging party that she had 10 days to amend her charge, the board vacated the dismissal, remanded the case, and ordered the general counsel to reissue the warning letter with the proper address.)

Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. City of Porterville, N.o. 1905-M/185:102
(The city did not unlawfully interfere with the union's right to access employees because the union representative never obtained the consent of the department head to enter the employees' work location, as is required by the city access policy.)

Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. County of Sierra, N.o. 1915-M/186:108
(The union's failure to respond to the county's request for clarification regarding its documentation request precluded a finding of bad faith bargaining. The county did not violate the act by conditioning the negotiation of economic matters on the resolution of non-economic matters because both the economic and non-economic issues were within the scope of bargaining.)

Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. Town of Paradise, N.o. 1906-M/185:105
(The town violated its memorandum of understanding and duty to bargain in good faith with the union by refusing to provide information regarding its on-call employee policy.)

Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. Town of Paradise, N.o. Ad-364-M/185:107
(The union's administrative appeal challenging the determination that its opposition to the charging party's exceptions was untimely is moot because the board has already affirmed the ALJ's proposed decision regarding the underlying charge.)
Seeley v. County of Santa Clara, No. 1877-M/183:107
(Absent evidence that an investigatory interview was conducted or that the charging party was discriminated against, the charge was dismissed.)

SEIU, Loc. 660 v. Orange County, No. 1868-M/182:97
(Because the existence of an unreasonable local rule does not establish a continuing violation, and because the charging party's harm occurred outside the statutory period for an unfair practice charge, the claim was dismissed as untimely.)

Siskiyou County Employees Assn./AFSCME Loc. 3899 v. County of Siskiyou, No. 1894-M/184:107
(The association did not establish that the county unilaterally altered employment terms when it failed to implement layoffs on a countywide basis.)

Stationary Engineers Loc. 39 v. City and County of San Francisco, No. 1890-M/184:106
(The city charter provision authorizing arbitration of bargaining impasses is not an unreasonable local rule, and the union's assertions of bad faith bargaining failed to state a prima facie case of surface bargaining.)

Teamsters Loc. 350 v. City of Los Altos, No. 1891-M/184:107
(Absent a request for information from the union, there is no basis for the charge that the city interfered with the union's right to represent bargaining unit employees by failing to provide information concerning employee discipline.)

Teamsters Loc. 381 v. City of Lompoc, No. 1879-M/183:107
(Because it would effectuate the purpose of the MMBA, the board granted the request for withdrawal of the charge.)

Teamsters Loc. 542 v. County of Imperial; California School Employees Assn. and its Imperial County Employees Chap. 2004, No. 1904-M/186:113
(A local county rule violated MMBA Sec. 3507.1 when it stipulated that in order for a representation election to be valid, a majority of eligible voters in each bargaining unit must vote. The MMBA requires only that a majority of those voting elect the exclusive representative.)

Tesfason v. City of Beverly Hills (Transportation Dept.), No. Ad-363-M/185:106
(The charging party's untimely filing of his appeal of the dismissal of his unfair practice charge was excused because there was good cause for the late filing.)

Treas v. Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific, No. 1919-M/186:115
(The charging party's allegation that the union breached its duty of fair representation was dismissed because the charging party failed to provide any facts regarding his contact with the union, thereby failing to establish abuse of discretion or dishonest judgment.)

Turlock Irrigation District Technical Employees Assn. v. Turlock Irrigation Dist., No. 1896-M/184:108
(The district's employee relations officer complied with local rules and the MMBA when he offered to consult with the association following rejection of the association's representation petition.)

Ventura County Professional Peace Officers Assn. v. City of Ventura, No. 1910-M/186:106
(The association's unfair practice charge was dismissed in part because the contract between it and the county authorized the county to unilaterally implement a mandatory overtime program to meet public necessity.)

Vorgias v. State Bar of California, No. 1904-M/185:102
(The unfair practice charge alleging wrongful termination was filed more than six months after the date of the charging party's termination and was not tolled while her action was pending in federal court.)

(The State Bar's administrative appeal challenging the determination that its opposition to the charging party's appeal was untimely is moot because the board already had affirmed the dismissal of the charge.)

---

**Trial Court Act Cases**

Keiser v. Lake County Superior Court, No. 1782-C/176:92
(The unfair practice charge was dismissed because the board lacked jurisdiction over the due process violation raised under the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act.)
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No. 1818a-H  Hawley v. UTPE, CWA L oc. 919

No. 1819a-H  Jimenez-Newby v. UTPE, CWA L oc. 9119
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No. 1871-H  Statewide University Police Assn. v. California State University

No. 1872  Pina v. Public Employees Union, L oc. 1

No. 1873  Estacio v. Modesto City School Dist.

No. 1874  Estacio et al. v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 007


No. 1876-H  California State Employees Assn., CSU Div., and California Faculty Assn. v. California State University

No. 1877-M  Seeley v. County of Santa Clarita


No. 1879-M  Teamsters L oc. 381 v. City of Lompoc

No. 1880  Oakland Education Assn. v. Oakland Unified School Dist.


No. 1882  Jones v. SEIU, L oc. 99
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No. 1886-H  California State University Employees Union v. California State University


No. 1888  Okereke v. United Teachers of Los Angeles

No. 1889-H  Wunder v. California Faculty Assn.

No. 1890-M  Stationary Engineers Loc. 39 v. City and County of San Francisco

No. 1891-M  Teamsters Loc. 350 v. City of Los Altos

No. 1892-M  Chan v. SEIU Loc. 790

No. 1893  California School Employees Assn. and its Local Chap. 77 v. Lodi Unified School Dist.

No. 1894-M  Siskiyou County Employees Assn./AFSCME Loc. 3899 v. County of Siskiyou


No. 1896-M  Turlock Irrigation District Technical Employees Assn. v. Turlock Irrigation Dist.

No. 1897  Gillead v. United Educators of San Francisco

No. 1898-M  Buck v. Amalgamated Transit Union, Loc. 1704

No. 1899  Gutierrez v. SEIU Loc. 99

No. 1900-M  Health Care Workers Union Loc. 250 v. Sutter County In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority

No. 1901-S  Dinkins v. SEIU Loc. 1000, CSEA

No. 1902  Benton v. Oakland Unified School Dist.

No. 1903  Wyman v. California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 374

No. 1904-M  Vorgias v. State Bar of California

No. 1905-M  Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. City of Porterville

No. 1906-M  Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. Town of Paradise


No. 1910-M  Ventura County Professional Peace Officers Assn. v. City of Ventura

No. 1911  Santa Clara Unified School Dist. v. California Federation of Teachers; United Teachers of Santa Clara, CTA/NEA

No. 1912-H  State Employees Trades Council v. Regents of the University of California

No. 1913-M  Tesfasion v. City of Beverly Hills (Transportation Dept.)

No. 1914-S  Burnett v. SEIU Loc. 1000, CSEA

No. 1915-M  Operating Engineers Loc. 3 v. County of Sierra

No. 1916-M  Teamsters Loc. 542 v. County of Imperial; California School Employees Assn. and its Imperial County Employees Chap. 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Case Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917-M</td>
<td>Langlois-Dul v. SEIU Loc. 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-S</td>
<td>Menaster v. Union of American Physicians &amp; Dentists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-M</td>
<td>Treas v. Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-M</td>
<td>Jurupa Community Services District Employees Assn. v. Jurupa Community Services Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 407 v. Desert Community College Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Ulmschneider v. Los Banos Teachers Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-S</td>
<td>Horspool v. State of California (Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-357</td>
<td>Victor Valley College Faculty Assn., CTA/NEA v. Victor Valley Community College Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-358-H</td>
<td>California State University v. California State University Employees Union and State Employees Trades Council-U nited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-359-S</td>
<td>AFSCME Loc. 2620 v. Department of Personnel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-361-M</td>
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