

**Nos. 12-5068 & 12-5138**

---

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, et al.,**

**Appellants/Cross-Appellees**

**v.**

**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, et al.,**

**Appellees/Cross-Appellants**

---

**ON CROSS-APPEALS FROM AN ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
C.A. No. 11-cv-01629-ABJ**

---

**APPELLEES/CROSS-APPELLANTS' PETITION FOR REHEARING  
AND REHEARING EN BANC**

---

**ABBY PROPIS SIMMS**  
*Acting Assistant General Counsel*

**DAWN L. GOLDSTEIN**  
*Supervisory Attorney*

**JOEL F. DILLARD**  
**MICAH P.S. JOST**  
**KEVIN P. FLANAGAN**  
*Attorneys*

**National Labor Relations Board**  
**1099 14th Street, N.W.**  
**Washington, D.C. 20570**  
**(202) 273-2930**

**LAFE E. SOLOMON**  
*Acting General Counsel*  
**CELESTE J. MATTINA**  
*Deputy General Counsel*  
**JOHN H. FERGUSON**  
*Associate General Counsel*  
**MARGERY E. LIEBER**  
*Associate General Counsel*

**National Labor Relations Board**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Authorities ..... iii

Statement of Issues and Their Exceptional Importance ..... 1

Argument.....6

    A. Where the NLRA requires an employer to speak or to tolerate  
    third-party speech, Section 8(c) of the NLRA does not preclude silence  
    from constituting or being evidence of an unfair labor practice .....6

    B. Long-established equitable tolling principles permit consideration of  
    tolling where a required notice of employee rights has not been posted..... 10

Conclusion ..... 15

Certificate of Parties Under Rule 28(a)(1) ..... 16

Certificate of Service ..... 17

Addendum ..... 1a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Beshears v. Asbill</i> , 930 F.2d 1348 (8th Cir. 1991) .....	12
<i>Chamber of Commerce v. Brown</i> , 554 U.S. 60 (2008) .....	6
<i>Chamber of Commerce v. NLRB</i> , Case No. 12-1757, 2013 WL 2678592 (4th Cir. June 14, 2013).....	2
<i>Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resource Defense Council, Inc.</i> , 467 U.S. 821 (1984).....	10, 14
<i>Eastex, Inc. v. NLRB</i> , 437 U.S. 556 (1978).....	4, 8
* <i>EEOC v. Kentucky State Police Department</i> , 80 F.3d 1086 (6th Cir. 1996) .....	5, 12
<i>Elliot v. Group Medical &amp; Surgical Service</i> , 714 F.2d 556 (5th Cir. 1983) .....	12
<i>Hammer v. Cardio Medical Products, Inc.</i> , 131 Fed. App'x. 829 (3d Cir. 2005) .....	12
* <i>Holland v. Florida</i> , 130 S.Ct. 2549 (2010).....	5, 13, 14
<i>ITT Industries, Inc. v. NLRB</i> , 413 F.3d 64 (D.C. Cir. 2005) .....	8
<i>Lake Butler Apparel Co. v. Secretary of Labor</i> , 519 F.2d 84 (5th Cir. 1975) .....	10

---

\* Authorities upon which we chiefly rely are marked with asterisks.

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
* <i>Lechmere v. NLRB</i> , 502 U.S. 527 (1992).....	8
<i>McClinton v. Alabama By-Products Corp.</i> , 743 F.2d 1483 (11th Cir. 1984) .....	12
* <i>Mercado v. Ritz-Carlton San Juan Hotel</i> , 410 F.3d 41 (1st Cir. 2005).....	2, 5, 11, 12, 14
<i>National Ass'n of Manufacturers. v. NLRB</i> , 846 F. Supp. 2d 34 (D.D.C. 2012).....	2
* <i>New York—New York, LLC v. NLRB</i> , 676 F.3d 193 (D.C. Cir. 2012).....	8
* <i>NLRB v. Acme Industrial Co.</i> , 385 U.S. 432 (1967).....	4
<i>NLRB v. J. Weingarten, Inc.</i> , 420 U.S. 251 (1975).....	5
<i>NLRB v. S&amp;H Grossinger's, Inc.</i> , 372 F.2d 26 (2d Cir. 1967).....	8
* <i>NLRB v. Truitt Manufacturing Co.</i> , 351 U.S. 149 (1956).....	3, 7
<i>Republic Aviation Corp. v. NLRB</i> , 324 U.S. 793 (1945).....	8
<i>Riley v. National Federation of the Blind of North Carolina, Inc.</i> , 487 U.S. 781 (1988).....	10
<i>Rochester Manufacturing Co.</i> , 323 NLRB 260 (1997), <i>aff'd mem.</i> , 194 F.3d 1311 (6th Cir. 1999) .....	6

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic &amp; Institutional Rights (FAIR)</i> , 547 U.S. 47 (2006).....	9, 10
<i>Schroeder v. Copley Newspaper</i> , 879 F.2d 266 (7th Cir. 1989) .....	12
* <i>Sibelius v. Auburn Regional Medical Center</i> , 133 S. Ct. 817 (2013).....	5,10, 11, 12, 14
<i>UAW-Labor Employment &amp; Training Corp. v. Chao</i> , 325 F. 3d 360 (D.C. Cir. 2003).....	6
<i>Union Pacific Railway Co. v. Chicago, Rock Island &amp; Pacific Railway Co.</i> , 163 U.S. 564 (1896).....	13
<i>Vance v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 716 F.2d 1010 (4th Cir. 1983) .....	12, 14
<i>West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette</i> , 319 U.S. 624 (1943).....	10
<i>Wilkerson v. Siegfried Insurance Agency, Inc.</i> , 683 F.2d 344 (10th Cir. 1982) .....	12
<i>Wooley v. Maynard</i> , 430 U.S. 705 (1977).....	10
<b>National Labor Relations Act, as amended</b> <b>(29 U.S.C. §§ 151 et seq.)</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
Section 6 (29 U.S.C. § 156) .....	4, 11
Section 8(a)(1) (29 U.S.C. § 158(a)(1)).....	2, 4, 7, 8

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>NLRA</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
Section 8(a)(5) (29 U.S.C. § 158(a)(5)).....	4
Section 8(c) (29 U.S.C. § 158(c)) .....	3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9
Section 8(d) (29 U.S.C. § 158(d)).....	3, 7
Section 10(b) (29 U.S.C. § 160(b)).....	2, 11, 13

<b>Other Statutes</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
42 U.S.C. § 405(a) .....	11
42 U.S.C. § 1302(a) .....	11
42 U.S.C. § 1395hh(a)(1).....	11
42 U.S.C. § 1395ii.....	11
45 U.S.C. § 152, Eighth .....	13

<b>Regulations</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
Notification of Employee Rights Under the National Labor Relations Act	
76 Fed. Reg. 54, 006 (Aug. 30, 2011) .....	1
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,007 .....	1
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,008 .....	7
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,009 .....	7
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,010 .....	7

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Regulations</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,011 .....	7
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,012 .....	7
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,013 .....	7
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,031 .....	2
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,032 .....	2
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033 .....	2, 11, 12, 14
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,034 .....	2, 14
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035 .....	2, 11, 12
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,036 .....	2
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,037 .....	2
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,046 .....	7
76 Fed. Reg. at 54,047 .....	7
<b>Other Sources</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
Senate Report No. 105-80 (1947) .....	6

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or the Board) respectfully petitions for rehearing, and rehearing en banc, of the May 7, 2013, decision of a panel of the Court (Circuit Judges Henderson and Brown and Senior Circuit Judge Randolph).

### **Statement of Issues and Their Exceptional Importance**

At issue in this case is the validity of a National Labor Relations Board Rule, Notification of Employee Rights Under the National Labor Relations Act, requiring all employers within the Board's jurisdiction to post an official government notice summarizing their employees' rights under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). 76 Fed. Reg. 54,006 (Aug. 30, 2011). The required notice is comparable to notices of employee rights that are routinely posted under other labor and employment statutes and reflects the same judgment—that employees need this information in order to exercise their statutory rights effectively. *Id.* at 54,006-07.

The Opinion for the Court, although noting that the parties' briefs were largely devoted to the question of whether the rule was beyond the Board's rule making authority (Op. 12), did not decide that important question. (Op. 30).<sup>1</sup> The issue was resolved in the Board's favor by the

---

<sup>1</sup> A concurring statement by two judges on the panel "would have also held" that the Board lacked rulemaking authority to require the notice. (Concurring Op. 1-4). The concurrence is phrased hypothetically, and is not



district court, *Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. NLRB*, 846 F. Supp. 2d 34, 45 (D.D.C. 2012), but has recently been resolved adversely to the Board by the Fourth Circuit, *Chamber of Commerce v. NLRB*, Case No. 12-1757, 2013 WL 2678592 (4th Cir. June 14, 2013).

Instead, the panel set the rule aside because it determined that the Board would not have issued a rule that could not be enforced in some manner and that none of the three mechanisms selected by the Board to enforce the rule was valid. (Op. 12-30). Those three mechanisms are (1) that an employer's failure to post the required notice constitutes an interference with employee rights within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) of the NLRA, 29 U.S.C. § 158(a)(1), (76 Fed. Reg. at 54,031-33); (2) that a knowing and willful refusal to comply with the posting requirement may be considered evidence of unlawful motive in a case in which motive is an issue (76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035-37); and (3) that the employer's failure to post may warrant equitable tolling of the six-month limitations period in Section 10(b) of the NLRA, 29 U.S.C. § 160(b), if the evidence satisfies the multifactor standard for equitable tolling set out in such cases as *Mercado v. Ritz-Carlton San Juan Hotel*, 410 F.3d 41, 46-47 n.8 (1st Cir. 2005), (76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033-34). Rehearing is warranted because the panel's reasoning with regard to the

---

the opinion of the Court, which expressly stated that the Board's rulemaking authority was an issue that "we do not decide." (Op. 30).

three enforcement mechanisms conflicts with decisions of the Supreme Court, this Circuit, and other United States Courts of Appeals.

In holding that the Board could not enforce its rule (1) by finding that a failure to post the required notice obstructed the free exercise of employee rights or (2) by finding that a deliberate refusal to post was evidence of hostility to employees' exercising their NLRA rights, the panel relied solely on Section 8(c) of the NLRA, 29 U.S.C. § 158(c). That section states: "The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof . . . shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice." The panel construed Section 8(c) as granting a right to silence that precludes the Board from finding a refusal to post a notice of employee rights either an unfair labor practice or evidence of an unfair labor practice. (Op. 12-23).

Decades of precedent conflict with the panel's conclusion that Section 8(c) of the NLRA includes a right to silence that precludes all unfair labor practice liability for failure to perform a duty to speak. With regard to the scope of the duty to bargain under Section 8(d), 29 U.S.C. § 158(d), for example, the Supreme Court has upheld the Board's determination that an employer's "refusal to attempt to substantiate a claim of inability to pay increased wages"—a failure to speak—is evidence of an unfair labor practice. *NLRB v. Truitt Mfg. Co.* 351 U.S. 149, 153 (1956). The Board may

also find an unfair labor practice if an employer fails to provide other relevant information to a union. *NLRB v. Acme Indus. Co.*, 385 U.S. 432, 438 (1967). It is equally firmly established that an employer's refusal to "host or accommodate another speaker's message" (Op. 19 n.13 (quotation omitted)) on its premises can constitute an unfair labor practice in spite of Section 8(c). *Eastex, Inc. v. NLRB*, 437 U.S. 556, 570-75 (1978).

These cases construing Sections 8(a)(5) and (1) of the NLRA demonstrate, contrary to the opinion of the Court, that when there is a duty to speak or accommodate another's speech, silence is properly considered evidence of an unfair labor practice or an unfair labor practice itself. Here, the Board determined that employers have a duty to post an official notice of employee rights. If, as the district court found, that determination was a valid exercise of the Board's authority under Section 6 of the NLRA, 29 U.S.C. § 156, then any Section 8(c) right to silence does not excuse the failure to perform that legal obligation. In short, the validity of subpart A of the rule is a threshold question that the panel should have addressed before ruling on the question of whether a refusal to post an official notice of employee rights may constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice.

The panel's reasons for setting aside the Board's third enforcement mechanism—equitable tolling—also warrant rehearing. The panel held that

the rule's equitable tolling mechanism was foreclosed because, at the time that Section 10(b) was enacted in 1947, ignorance of legal rights was not an accepted basis for tolling. (Op. 23-30). In so ruling, the panel failed to consider controlling authority establishing that the Board has broad discretion to craft appropriate exceptions to the NLRA's limitations period. *See Sibelius v. Auburn Reg'l Med. Ctr.*, 133 S. Ct. 817, 821, 824-28 (2013). The panel also failed to recognize that equitable tolling is a flexible doctrine which evolves "to meet new situations," *Holland v. Florida*, 130 S. Ct. 2549, 2563 (2010)(internal citation omitted), and that Congress entrusted the Board with the "responsibility to adapt the Act to changing patterns of industrial life," *NLRB v. J. Weingarten, Inc.*, 420 U.S. 251, 266 (1975). In recent years, courts have generally recognized that principles of equitable tolling are applicable in notice posting cases. *See, e.g., EEOC v. Ky. State Police Dept.*, 80 F.3d 1086, 1096 (6th Cir. 1996); *Mercado*, 410 F.3d at 47 n.8. Because the Board reasonably exercised its *Auburn* authority by adapting to the purposes of the NLRA the same principles that courts have applied in determining whether a failure to post notices of employee rights required by law warrants equitable tolling, the panel erred in invalidating the Board's tolling rule.

The panel's decision invalidating the rule depends upon its striking down all three of the rule's enforcement mechanisms. Accordingly, the case must be reheard if the panel erred in invalidating any of those mechanisms.

## ARGUMENT

**A. Where the NLRA requires an employer to speak or to tolerate third-party speech, Section 8(c) of the NLRA does not preclude silence from constituting or being evidence of an unfair labor practice.**

The Opinion of the Court relies solely on the right to silence it finds in Section 8(c) to hold that the Board may not treat a failure to post a notice of employee rights either as an unfair labor practice or as evidence of an unfair labor practice. (Op. 23). The existence of such a right is far from clear.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The text of Section 8(c) refers only to the expression or dissemination of views and makes no mention of any right to silence. The legislative history is likewise focused only on employers' and unions' expression of their respective views. *See Chamber of Commerce v. Brown*, 554 U.S. 60, 67-68 (2008); S. Rep. No. 105-80, at 23 (1947). Nor is a right to silence widely recognized in the case law. To the contrary, a prior decision of this Court merely assumed *arguendo* that there might be such a Section 8(c) right, reasoning that if Section 8(c) incorporates principles of the First Amendment, it might be deemed to incorporate the First Amendment right to silence as well. *UAW-Labor Emp't & Training Corp. v. Chao*, 325 F.3d 360, 365 (D.C. Cir. 2003). The Court also noted that a leading Board decision finding that an employer had no duty to speak relied neither on Section 8(c) nor on any right to silence. *Id.* (discussing *Rochester Mfg. Co.*, 323 NLRB 260, 262 (1997), *aff'd mem.*, 194 F.3d 1311 (6th Cir. 1999)). The Opinion of the Court here is the first decision to hold that there is a Section 8(c) right to silence.

Nevertheless, a Section 8(c) right to silence—assuming *arguendo* that one exists—would not be a defense if a decision or rule of the Board has validly imposed a duty to speak. In assuming otherwise, the panel overlooked that the same Congress that enacted Section 8(c) also enacted Section 8(d), which affirmatively obliges employers to speak in the performance of their obligation to bargain in good faith with their employees’ exclusive representative. Silence in the face of that obligation is an unfair labor practice. *Truitt Mfg. Co.*, 351 U.S. at 153. Where there is a duty to speak, as the Board concluded in promulgating its notice posting requirement (76 Fed. Reg. 54,008-12, 54,046-47), Section 8(c) does not shield silence.

Similarly, in concluding that Section 8(c) was designed to protect employers from ever being required by the Board to host or accommodate another speaker’s message, even if factual (Op. 19 & n.13), the panel failed to take into account conflicting Supreme Court and Circuit decisions. Both before and after the enactment of Section 8(c), Section 8(a)(1) of the NLRA has been construed to require employers to tolerate unwelcome speech in the

---

The Board itself has never definitively decided whether Section 8(c) includes a right to silence. In the portion of the preamble to the rule discussed by the panel (Op. 21), the Board stated only that “even if” the posting rule were understood to compel speech, the result under Section 8(c) would be the same as under the First Amendment. 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,013.

workplace where, after balancing the competing interests, the Board has determined that a refusal to tolerate that speech was an interference with the Section 7 rights of employees and therefore an unfair labor practice. *See, e.g., Lechmere v. NLRB*, 502 U.S. 527, 539-40 (1992) (citing, *inter alia*, *NLRB v. S&H Grossinger's, Inc.*, 372 F.2d 26, 29-30 (2d Cir. 1967) (mountain resort required “to permit nonemployee union organizers to come on its premises in order to solicit employees”)); *Eastex, Inc.*, 437 U.S. at 570-75 (employer required to permit distribution of union newsletter on its premises); *Republic Aviation Corp. v. NLRB*, 324 U.S. 793, 803 (1945) (employer must permit on-premises union solicitation by employees); *New York–New York, LLC v. NLRB*, 676 F.3d 193, 194, 196 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (employer must allow “employees of an onsite contractor [to] distribut[e] union-related handbills on the property” in non-work areas open to the public); *ITT Indus., Inc. v. NLRB*, 413 F.3d 64, 68-77 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (requiring access of off duty employees from other facilities).

The panel acknowledged that “apart from the § 8(c) bar against unfair labor practice charges, the National Labor Relations Act [does] not give employers an unconstrained right to silence.” (Op. 21). But the panel overlooked that just as Section 8(a)(1) constrains employers—in spite of Section 8(c)—to tolerate unwelcome speech of employees or non-employees

on their property, it also may require employers to tolerate an official government notice of employee rights. If, as the district court held, the Board acted within its delegated authority in finding that a refusal to post the required notice obstructs the free exercise of employee rights, then Section 8(c) is not a defense to the performance of this legal duty.

\* \* \*

In sum, the panel's explication of Section 8(c) reflects a profound misunderstanding of that provision's scope and of its consistent application by the Board and courts. A proper understanding would have led the Court to conclude that, if subpart A of the Board's rule is valid, a refusal to post an official notice of employee rights—like the violation of other duties to speak or to tolerate third-party speech—may constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice. Therefore, rehearing is warranted on this issue.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The panel's invalidation of the rule's unfair labor practice and animus enforcement mechanisms was based solely on Section 8(c) and not on the First Amendment. To the extent that the panel found no First Amendment infirmity, its approach is sound and in accord with the holding of *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights*, 547 U.S. 47 (2006) (“FAIR”), portions of which the panel relied upon in construing Section 8(c). *FAIR* held that the posting of a government-required notice of on-site military recruiting did not “sufficiently interfere with any message” of schools. *Id.* at 64. Precisely because the posting was required by law, the posting was not inherently expressive of the schools' views and did not encroach upon their First Amendment right to silence. *Id.* at 65. *FAIR* stated that “it trivializes the freedom protected” by the First Amendment compelled speech doctrine to suggest that compelled statements of fact are comparable to situations in which words of direct and personal consequence were being forced into the



**B. Long-established equitable tolling principles permit consideration of tolling where a required notice of employee rights has not been posted.**

The panel also acted contrary to controlling authority in striking down the Board's tolling rule. As the Supreme Court recently confirmed, agencies have discretion to craft exceptions to nonjurisdictional statutes of limitations, so long as those exceptions are not arbitrary, capricious, or manifestly contrary to the statute. *Auburn*, 133 S. Ct. at 821 (citing *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 844 (1984)). In *Auburn*, the Court upheld a regulation which the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services had promulgated pursuant to a broad grant of rulemaking authority, providing for a three-year "good cause" exception to a statutorily provided six-month statute of limitations. *Id.* at 826. The Court made clear that it is for an agency, applying its "practical experience," to determine in the first instance what extensions to its filing deadlines, if any, are appropriate. *Id.*

---

mouths of private citizens. *Id.* at 61-62 (discussing *W. Va. Bd. of Ed. v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943) (compelled pledge of allegiance), *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705, 717 (1977) (compelled display of the state motto), and *Riley v. Nat'l Fed'n of the Blind of N.C., Inc.*, 487 U.S. 781, 797-98 (1988) (compelled disclosure of fundraising facts designed to discourage some forms of solicitation)). The same is true with respect to compelled notices of workplace rights. *E.g.*, *Lake Butler Apparel Co. v. Sec'y of Labor*, 519 F.2d 84, 89 (5th Cir. 1975) (posting of a government-required notice of the employees' legal rights "does not by any stretch of the imagination reflect one way or the other on the views of the employer").

The Board's authority to craft appropriate exceptions to the NLRA's limitations period is as broad as that of the Secretary in *Auburn*.<sup>4</sup> And the Board's exercise of its authority is equally entitled to affirmance. The Board reasonably construed Section 10(b)'s nonjurisdictional statute of limitations and justifiably adopted the view—held by most courts of appeals—that an employer's failure to post a required notice in the workplace may be a factor supporting equitable tolling.<sup>5</sup> The Board's tolling rule hews closely to equitable tolling principles used by the courts in this setting. As the Board explained,

[f]ailure to post required notices deprives employees of both the knowledge of their rights and of the availability of avenues of redress. Accordingly, the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Eleventh Circuits have adopted the doctrine that the

---

<sup>4</sup> The Secretary has authority to “prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the administration of the insurance programs under [Medicare].” 42 U.S.C. § 1395hh(a)(1); *accord* 42 U.S.C. § 1302(a); 42 U.S.C. § 1395ii (incorporating 42 U.S.C. § 405(a)). Similarly, Congress authorized the Board to make “such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of [the NLRA].” 29 U.S.C. § 156.

<sup>5</sup> The Board made clear that it would consider other factors, including potential prejudice to a respondent, as well. 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035. In particular, the Board cited *Mercado*, in which the First Circuit listed “case-specific factors” such as “(1) lack of actual notice of the filing requirement; (2) lack of constructive knowledge of the filing requirement; (3) diligence in pursuing one’s rights; (4) absence of prejudice to the defendant; and (5) a plaintiff’s reasonableness in remaining ignorant of the [filing] requirement.” 410 F.3d at 48 (quotation omitted). The court explained that “[t]hese factors are not exhaustive, however; it is in the nature of equity to entertain case-specific factors that may counsel in favor of tolling.” *Id.* (quotation omitted).

failure to post required employment law notices may result in equitable tolling of the statute of limitations.

76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033.

The cases sharing this view are predicated on a judgment that employees in the modern workplace are disadvantaged in exercising their statutory rights if those rights are not conveniently posted.<sup>6</sup> Under the NLRA, as other employee rights statutes, individual charging parties often do not fully comprehend their rights and have had little prior interaction with the Board, and it would be unfair to impute an understanding of legal rights to such unrepresented persons. The requirement to post a notice thus represents an informed policy choice that such notice is necessary to remove workers' disadvantage.<sup>7</sup>

The panel's sole basis for setting aside the Board's reasonable exercise of its *Auburn* authority is its view that the Board is foreclosed from invoking

---

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., *Mercado*, 410 F.3d at 47-48; *Hammer v. Cardio Med. Prods., Inc.*, 131 F. App'x. 829, 831-832 (3d Cir. 2005); *Vance v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 716 F.2d 1010, 1012-13 (4th Cir. 1983); *Elliot v. Group Med. & Surgical Serv.*, 714 F.2d 556, 563-64 (5th Cir. 1983); *Ky. State Police Dep't*, 80 F.3d at 1096; *Schroeder v. Copley Newspaper*, 879 F.2d 266, 271-72 (7th Cir. 1989); *Beshears v. Asbill*, 930 F.2d 1348, 1352 (8th Cir. 1991); *McClinton v. Ala. By-Prods. Corp.*, 743 F.2d 1483, 1486 (11th Cir. 1984). Only the Tenth Circuit disagrees. *Wilkerson v. Siegfried Ins. Agency, Inc.*, 683 F.2d 344, 347 (10th Cir. 1982).

<sup>7</sup> Unions, by contrast, are not entitled such tolling. 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035; cf. *Auburn* 133 S. Ct. at 826-28 (sophisticated repeat litigants less likely to require tolling).

these equitable tolling principles because, when Section 10(b) was enacted, equitable tolling based on the failure to post a notice was not one of the background principles Congress can reasonably be presumed to have known about and intended to be available to the Board. (Op. 25-30). But the panel overlooked the Supreme Court's teaching in *Holland* that one of the key underpinnings of equitable tolling is that it has always been flexible enough to evolve to meet "new situations." 130 S. Ct. at 2563 (quotation omitted).

Indeed, equity

has always preserved the elements of flexibility and expansiveness, so that new [remedies] may be invented, or old ones modified, in order to . . . satisfy the needs of a progressive social condition, in which new primary rights and duties are constantly arising, and new kinds of wrongs are constantly committed.

*Union Pac. Ry. Co. v. Chicago, R.I. & P. Ry. Co.*, 163 U.S. 564, 601 (1896) (quotation omitted).

In 1947, there were no cases dealing with the issue addressed by the Board in its rule. At that time, there was only one extant federal workplace notice, and it was limited to only a few industries. *See* Railway Labor Act, 45 U.S.C. § 152, Eighth (1934). Since then, however, required workplace notices of employee rights have proliferated. Consistent with longstanding equitable principles, *see Union Pacific*, 163 U.S. at 601, that new development has been accompanied by new applications of equitable tolling.

There is now widespread recognition that the failure to post a notice of employee rights is a factor to be considered in determining whether an employee has demonstrated the kind of extraordinary circumstances that warrant tolling under established equitable standards.

Thus, even though Title VII was passed in 1964—when, as the panel noted, tolling for “ignorance” was not “recognized,” (Op. 23-30)—the courts have nonetheless concluded that failure to post a notice of rights under Title VII can justify tolling. *Mercado*, 410 F. 3d at 47-48 (discussing cases). The relatively new requirement to post a notice of workplace rights is a changed circumstance that almost all of the other circuits believe requires consideration in applying equitable tolling principles to “new situations.” *Holland*, 130 S. Ct. at 2563. The Board’s rule is clearly in accord with this “prevailing judicial view.” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033-34 (citing *Vance v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 716 F.2d 1010 (4th Cir. 1983)).<sup>8</sup>

Like the “good cause” exception promulgated by the Secretary in *Auburn*, the Board’s rule “survives inspection under [*Chevron*’s] deferential standard . . . even if it differs from how the court would have interpreted the statute in the absence of an agency regulation.” 133 S. Ct. at 826. Because the Board reasonably exercised its rulemaking authority in accordance with

---

<sup>8</sup> The panel’s expressed doubt regarding the validity of the prevailing judicial view, (Op. 28), underscores the need for rehearing in this case.

longstanding equitable tolling principles, its choice of this mechanism for implementing the duty to post is entitled to deference.

### CONCLUSION

The Board respectfully requests that the Court grant rehearing or rehearing en banc. Thereafter, the Court should vacate the panel decision and the panel should decide the threshold question: whether the district court correctly decided that Section 6 of the NLRA authorized the Board to require employers to post an official notice of employee rights under the NLRA.

LAFE E. SOLOMON  
Acting General Counsel

CELESTE J. MATTINA  
Deputy General Counsel

JOHN H. FERGUSON  
Associate General Counsel

MARGERY E. LIEBER  
Associate General Counsel

National Labor Relations Board  
June 2013

/s/ Abby Propis Simms  
ABBY PROPIS SIMMS  
Acting Assistant General Counsel

DAWN L. GOLDSTEIN  
Supervisory Attorney

JOEL F. DILLARD  
MICAH P.S. JOST  
KEVIN P. FLANAGAN  
Attorneys

Special Litigation Branch  
National Labor Relations Board  
1099 14th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Phone: (202) 273-2930  
Fax: (202) 273-1799  
E-mail: [Abby.Simms@nrlb.gov](mailto:Abby.Simms@nrlb.gov)

**CERTIFICATE OF PARTIES UNDER RULE 28(a)(1)(A)**

Plaintiffs are the National Association of Manufacturers; Coalition for a Democratic Workplace; National Right to Work Legal Defense & Education Foundation, Inc.; National Federation of Independent Business; Southeast Sealing, Inc.; and Racquetball Centers, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, doing business as Lehigh Valley Racquetball & 24-7 Fitness Clubs.

Defendants are the National Labor Relations Board (“the Board”), individual Members of the Board, and its Acting General Counsel, who are named in their official capacities.

The following groups and individual participated as amicus curiae in support of the Board: Professor Charles J. Morris, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Change to Win, National Employment Law Project, Restaurant Opportunities Center, and Food Chain Workers Alliance.

Thirty-one Members of the U.S. House of Representatives filed an amicus curiae brief in support of the plaintiffs.

/s/ Abby Propis Simms

Abby Propis Simms

Attorney for Appellees/Cross-Appellants

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 22, 2013, the foregoing petition was filed with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit using the appellate CM/ECF system.

I certify that the foregoing document was served electronically on the following counsel for Plaintiff Employers, as well as on counsel for the amici in this case, most of whom have consented to electronic service (with the exception of Professor Charles Morris, who received the brief by email and first-class mail; Christine Owens, who received the brief by first-class mail; and Lynn Rhinehart, who consented to receiving the brief by email:

Maurice Baskin  
Littler Mendelson PC  
1150 17th Street, NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202-842-3400  
Fax: 202-318-4048  
E-mail: mbaskin@littler.com

Attorney for the Coalition for a  
Democratic Workplace

H. Christopher Bartolomucci  
Bancroft PLLC  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 470  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: (202) 234-0090

Peter N. Kirsanow  
Bryan Schwartz  
Maynard Buck  
Patrick O. Peters  
Benesch Friedlander Coplan &  
Aronoff LLP  
200 Public Square, Suite 2300  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2378  
Tel.: 216-363-4500  
Fax: 216-363-4588  
E-mail: pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com  
bschwartz@beneschlaw.com



Fax: (202) 234-2806  
cbartolomucci@bancroftpllc.com

Attorney for National Federation of  
Independent Business, Southeast  
Sealing, Inc., and Racquetball  
Centers, Inc. d/b/a Lehigh Valley  
Racquet & 24-7 Fitness Clubs

Glenn M. Taubman  
William L. Messenger  
John N. Raudabaugh  
c/o National Right to Work Legal  
Defense and Education Foundation,  
Inc.  
8001 Braddock Road, Suite 600  
Springfield, VA 22160  
Tel: (703) 321-8510  
E-mails: gmt@nrtw.org  
wlm@nrtw.org  
jnr@nrtw.org

Attorneys for National Right to Work  
Legal Defense and Education  
Foundation, Inc

Charles J. Morris  
5085 Caminito Exquisito  
San Diego, CA 92130-2851  
Tel: 858-793-1095  
CJMMorris@aol.com

Attorney for Amicus Curiae  
Professor  
Charles J. Morris

William G. Miossi  
Winston & Strawn LLP  
1700 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 282-5708  
(202) 282-5100 (facsimile)  
wmiossi@winston.com

Attorneys for National Association of  
Manufacturers

Charles I. Cohen  
Jonathan C. Fritts  
David R. Broderdorf  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2541  
202-739-3000  
ccohen@morganlewis.com  
jfritts@morganlewis.com  
dbroderdorf@morganlewis.com

Attorneys for Amici Curiae  
31 Members of the U.S. House of  
Representatives

Lynn Rhinehart  
American Federation of Labor &  
Congress of Industrial Organizations  
815 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202-637-5155

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae  
American Federation of Labor &  
Congress of Industrial Organizations

Nicole G. Berger  
Walter Kamiat  
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: 202-730-7813

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Change  
to Win

Christine L. Owens  
National Employment Law Project  
1620 Eye Street N.W., Suite 210  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: 202-887-8202, ext. 304

Attorney for Amici Curiae National  
Employment Law Project,  
Restaurant Opportunities Center  
United & The Food Chain Workers  
Alliance

/s/ Abby Propis Simms  
ABBY PROPIS SIMMS  
Acting Assistant General Counsel  
for Special Litigation  
National Labor Relations Board  
1099 14th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Phone: (202) 273-2934  
Fax: (202) 273-1799  
Email: [Abby.Simms@nrlb.gov](mailto:Abby.Simms@nrlb.gov)

Dated: July 22, 2013  
Washington, DC

# **ADDENDUM**

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

---

Argued September 11, 2012

Decided May 7, 2013

No. 12-5068

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, ET AL.,  
APPELLANTS/CROSS-APPELLEES

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, ET AL.,  
APPELLEES/CROSS-APPELLANTS

---

Consolidated with 12-5138

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia  
(No. 1:11-cv-01629)

---

*Maurice Baskin* argued the cause for appellants/cross-appellees. With him on the briefs were *Peter N. Kirsanow*, *Bryan Schwartz*, *Maynard Buck*, *Patrick O. Peters*, *Glenn M. Taubman*, *William L. Messenger*, *John N. Raudabaugh*, and *H. Christopher Bartolomucci*. *William G. Miossi* entered an appearance.

*Doreen S. Davis*, *Charles I. Cohen*, *Jonathan C. Fritts*, and *David R. Broderdorf* were on the brief for *amici curiae* The Honorable John Kline, Chairman, Committee of Education and

the Workforce, The House of Representatives, et al. in support of appellants/cross-appellees.

*Dawn L. Goldstein*, Attorney, National Labor Relations Board, argued the cause for appellees/cross-appellants. With her on the briefs were *John H. Ferguson*, Associate General Counsel, *Margery E. Lieber*, Deputy Associate General Counsel, *Eric G. Moskowitz*, Assistant General Counsel, *Abby Propis Simms*, Deputy Assistant General Counsel, and *Kevin P. Flanagan*, Attorney. *Linda Dreeben*, Deputy Associate General Counsel, entered an appearance.

*Lynn Rhinehart*, *Charles J. Morris*, *Christine L. Owens*, and *Walter Kamiat* were on the brief for *amici curiae* Professor Charles J. Morris, et al. in support of appellees/cross-appellants.

Before: HENDERSON and BROWN, *Circuit Judges*, and RANDOLPH, *Senior Circuit Judge*.

Opinion for the Court filed by *Senior Circuit Judge* RANDOLPH.

Concurring opinion filed by *Circuit Judge* HENDERSON, with whom *Circuit Judge* BROWN joins.

RANDOLPH, *Senior Circuit Judge*: The National Labor Relations Board declared in a rule that employers subject to its jurisdiction would be guilty of an unfair labor practice if they did not post on their properties and on their websites a “Notification of Employee Rights under the National Labor Relations Act.” 76 Fed. Reg. 54,006 (Aug. 30, 2011). The rule applies to “nearly 6 million” employers, “the great majority” of which are small businesses. *Id.* at 54,042–43. Trade associations and other organizations representing employers across the country filed complaints in the district court, claiming that the

Board's rule violated the National Labor Relations Act and the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The Board's action departs from its historic practice. From its inception in 1935, the Board has exhibited a "negative attitude" toward setting down principles in rulemaking, rather than adjudication. *Bell Aerospace Co. v. NLRB*, 475 F.2d 485, 496 (2d Cir. 1973) (Friendly, J.), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 416 U.S. 267 (1974); *see also* R. Alexander Acosta, *Rebuilding the Board: An Argument for Structural Change, Over Policy Prescriptions, at the NLRB*, 5 FIU L. REV. 347, 351 (2010); Jeffrey S. Lubbers, *The Potential of Rulemaking by the NLRB*, 5 FIU L. REV. 411 (2010). Despite its "broad" rulemaking authority under § 6 of the National Labor Relations Act, *Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. NLRB*, 499 U.S. 606, 613 (1991), the Board had "used rulemaking as a means of announcing—or considering—its policies on only a few occasions" until 1989, the year in which it issued the substantive regulation upheld in *American Hospital*, ROBERT A. GORMAN & MATTHEW W. FINKIN, BASIC TEXT ON LABOR LAW: UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING 21 (2d ed. 2004).

The path leading to the posting rule goes back to 1993 when a law professor petitioned the Board. *See* 75 Fed. Reg. 80,410, 80,411 (Dec. 22, 2010). Despite prodding from this law professor and, later, several others, the Board declined to act. Then, in 2010, the Board issued a notice of proposed rulemaking. *Id.* at 80,410. After receiving more than 7000 comments, the Board published a final rule on August 30, 2011, with Member Hayes dissenting. 76 Fed. Reg. 54,006.

The final rule provides that "[a]ll employers subject to the NLRA must post notices to employees, in conspicuous places, informing them of their NLRA rights, together with Board contact information and information concerning basic

enforcement procedures, in the language set forth in the Appendix to Subpart A of this part.” 29 C.F.R. § 104.202(a). In addition, employers who customarily communicate with their employees electronically must publish the Board’s notice on their intranet or internet sites. *See id.* § 104.202(f). The required poster, which is published as an addendum to this opinion, must be at least 11 inches by 17 inches and in a type size and format the Board prescribes. *See id.* § 104.202(b). The poster informs employees of their right to form, join, or assist a union; to bargain collectively through representatives of their choosing; to discuss wages, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment with fellow employees or a union; to take action to improve working conditions; to strike and picket; or to choose not to engage in any of these activities. *See* 29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app. The poster also recites more specific employee rights the Board derived from judicial and Board interpretations of the Act. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,018.<sup>1</sup> The poster states, for example, that it is “illegal” for an employer to prohibit employees “from wearing union hats, buttons, t-shirts, and pins in the workplace” or to “[s]py on or videotape peaceful union activities and gatherings or pretend to do so.” 29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app. The poster also states that it is “illegal” for a union to “[t]hreaten or coerce [an employee] in order to gain . . . support for the union” or to “[r]efuse to process a grievance because [the employee] ha[s] criticized union officials or . . . [is] not a member of the union.” *Id.*

As an enforcement mechanism, the rule declares that an employer’s failure to post the notice is an unfair labor practice—that is, it “may be found to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed by

---

<sup>1</sup> The final rule states that if the law developed by the courts or the Board changes, the Board may—by “rules, regulations, or orders”—alter the poster’s content. 29 C.F.R. § 104.202(c).

NLRA Section 7, 29 U.S.C. 157, in violation of NLRA Section 8(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(1).” 29 C.F.R. § 104.210.

Section 7 of the Act provides that employees

shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in [section 8(a)(3) of the Act].

29 U.S.C. § 157. (Under § 8(a)(1) it is an “unfair labor practice” for an employer “to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in [section 7 of the Act].” *Id.* § 158(a)(1).)

The rule contains two additional enforcement devices. The Board may suspend the running of the six-month limitations period for filing any unfair-labor-practice charge under § 10(b), 29 U.S.C. § 160(b), “unless the employee has received actual or constructive notice that the conduct complained of is unlawful.” 29 C.F.R. § 104.214(a). And the Board may consider an employer’s “knowing and willful refusal to comply with the requirement to post the employee notice as evidence of unlawful motive in a case in which motive is an issue.” *Id.* § 104.214(b).

The Board invoked § 6 of the Act as authority for the rule. That section provides that the “Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner



prescribed by [the Administrative Procedure Act], such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions” of the Act. 29 U.S.C. § 156. The Board thought the rule was necessary because employees were not aware of their rights under the Act. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,006. The Board offered three reasons why: unions now represent only a small percentage of the private workforce, by the latest count just 7.3 percent;<sup>2</sup> immigrants make up “an increasing proportion of the nation’s work force” and “are unlikely to be familiar with their workplace rights”; and many high-school students about to enter the work force are not familiar with labor laws. 75 Fed. Reg. at 80,411.

“Enforcement of the NLRA,” the Board stated, “depend[s] on the existence of outside actors who are not only aware of their rights but also know where they may seek to vindicate them within appropriate timeframes.” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,010. By this, the Board meant that unfair-labor-practice cases must begin with a charge filed by an employee or a union or an employer. “The charge triggers an inquiry that may (or may not) result in the issuance of a *complaint* by the Board . . . . However, neither the Board nor its agents are authorized to institute charges *sua sponte*.” GORMAN & FINKIN, BASIC TEXT ON LABOR LAW, *supra*, at 10. Board orders finding an unfair labor practice after proceedings on a complaint are “not self-executing.” *Id.* at 14. Rather, the Board must petition a court of appeals for enforcement—that is, for a court order requiring the offending party to comply with the Board’s order. *See id.*

---

<sup>2</sup> The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that unions represented 7.3 percent of private-sector employees in 2012. Press Release, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Union Members—2012 (table 3) (Jan. 23, 2013), *available at* <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/union2.pdf>.

Member Hayes, dissenting, disputed both the Board's authority under § 6 and the evidentiary support the Board majority relied upon in concluding the posting rule was needed. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,037–42.

On cross-motions for summary judgment, the district court ruled as follows. The court first decided that the Board had the authority, under § 6 of the Act, to promulgate the posting rule. *See Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. NLRB*, 846 F. Supp. 2d 34, 48 (D.D.C. 2012). Citing *Mourning v. Family Publications Service, Inc.*, 411 U.S. 356, 369 (1973), and other decisions, the court determined that the rule was reasonably related to the purposes of the Act, and that the plaintiffs' contrary arguments, based mainly on the Act's legislative history, were unpersuasive. *See id.* at 43–48. But citing § 8(a)(1) and § 8(c), of which more hereafter, the court ruled that the Board had no authority to make a “blanket advance determination that a failure to post will always constitute an unfair labor practice,” although the court did not preclude such a finding in an individual case. *Id.* at 54–55. The district court also held invalid the section of the rule tolling the § 10(b) limitations period if the employer failed to post the notice. Whether there should be tolling, the court ruled, depended on equitable considerations that had to be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* at 55–58. As to the part of the rule that permitted an employer's failure to post to be considered as evidence of an improper motive, the court asserted, first, that plaintiffs had not made a specific argument against this provision, and second, that even if they had done so, the court would uphold it because “the Rule does not make a blanket finding that will govern future individual adjudications or create a presumption of anti-union animus whenever an employer fails to post the provision.” *Id.* at 63 & n.26.

Having determined that two of the rule's provisions were invalid, the court turned to the question whether the entire rule

should fall. The court held that the Board would have wanted the posting requirement to stand even if two of three means of enforcing it were invalid. *See id.* at 61–63.

The case is here on plaintiffs' appeal and the Board's cross-appeal.<sup>3</sup>

One month after the district court issued its opinion, the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina held that the Board lacked authority to promulgate the rule. *See Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. v. NLRB*, 856 F. Supp. 2d 778 (D.S.C. 2012). The appeal in that case is now pending before the Fourth Circuit.

## I

Although the parties have not raised it, one issue needs to be resolved before we turn to the merits of the case. After oral argument in this case, we held that a recess appointment is constitutionally valid only if the appointment is made during an intersession recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy that arose during that same intersession recess. *See Noel Canning v. NLRB*, 705 F.3d 490, 506, 512, 514 (D.C. Cir. 2013). The Board had four members when the Federal Register published the proposed notice-posting rule on December 22, 2010. Three members, Wilma B. Liebman, Mark G. Pearce, and Brian Hayes, were confirmed by the Senate. *See* 156 CONG. REC. S5281 (daily ed. June 22, 2010) (Pearce and Hayes); 152 CONG. REC. S8906–07

---

<sup>3</sup> On April 17, 2012, a panel of this court granted plaintiffs' motion for a stay of the rule pending these appeals. *See Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. NLRB*, No. 12-5068, 2012 WL 4328371 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 17, 2012) (unpublished order).

(daily ed. Aug. 3, 2006) (Liebman).<sup>4</sup> The fourth member, Craig Becker, was appointed by the President on March 27, 2010, during an intrasession recess of the Senate. To the extent that *Noel Canning* applies—we assume, without deciding, that it does—Becker’s appointment was constitutionally invalid.

The Board can lawfully act with a quorum of three members. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 153(b); *New Process Steel, L.P. v. NLRB*, 130 S. Ct. 2635, 2640 (2010). Chairman Liebman’s term expired on August 27, 2011. Her seat was not immediately filled. That left the Board without a valid quorum by the time the final rule was published in the Federal Register on August 30, 2011. But assuming, again without deciding, that the existence of a valid quorum is a jurisdictional issue or that we otherwise may exercise our discretion to raise the issue *sua sponte*, we see no problem here.

The Federal Register Act requires a regulation (or other document) to be filed with the Office of the Federal Register before it is published in the Federal Register. *See* 44 U.S.C. § 1503.<sup>5</sup> The date and time of filing is noted on the document, and upon filing, a copy of the document is immediately available for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register, even though the document will not be published until

---

<sup>4</sup> Wilma Liebman had been confirmed on November 8, 1997, for the remainder of the term that expired on December 16, 1997, and for a term that expired on December 16, 2002, *see* 143 CONG. REC. S12,214 (daily ed. Nov. 8, 1997), and on November 14, 2002, for a term that expired on August 27, 2006, *see* 148 CONG. REC. S11,031 (daily ed. Nov. 14, 2002).

<sup>5</sup> Receipt of the document by the Office does not constitute “filing.” Rather, a document is filed for public inspection “only after it has been received, processed and assigned a publication date.” 1 C.F.R. § 17.2(a).

later. *See id.*<sup>6</sup> The Federal Register Act further provides that the filing of a document required to be published in the Federal Register constitutes constructive notice to anyone subject to or affected by it. *See* 44 U.S.C. § 1507.

In light of these provisions, we believe the date of filing is the relevant time for determining whether the Board had a valid quorum. Chairman Liebman signed the final rule on August 22, 2011, and the rule was filed with the Office of the Federal Register on August 25, 2011, before her term expired, when the Board still had a constitutionally appointed quorum. Once the rule was filed with the Office of the Federal Register, the Board had taken all the steps necessary to issue the rule—there was nothing left for the Board to do. All that remained was for the rule to be published in the Federal Register, but that was in the hands of the Office of the Federal Register.

The Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice has also taken the view that, for purposes of determining whether an agency has complied with a statutory deadline for issuing regulations, promulgation takes place when the final regulations are filed with the Office of the Federal Register, regardless of when the regulations are published in the Federal Register. *See* Federal Register Act—Date of “Promulgation” of Law Enforcement Assistance Admin. Regs., 1 Op. O.L.C. 12 (1977).

We employed similar reasoning in *Braniff Airways, Inc. v. Civil Aeronautics Board*, when we concluded that an order of the Civil Aeronautics Board was valid even though the chairman resigned and the Board thereby lost a quorum between the time

---

<sup>6</sup> Documents are also posted to the Office’s website. *See* Electronic Public Inspection Desk, Office of the Federal Register, <http://www.ofr.gov/inspection.aspx>.

the order was signed and entered and the time it was served on the parties. *See* 379 F.2d 453, 459 (D.C. Cir. 1967). Although the Aeronautics Board had stated that “a ‘proposed decision of the Board does not become effective until an opinion and order . . . has been approved, issued, and served,’” our view was that “once all members have voted for an award and caused it to be issued the order is not nullified because of incapacity, intervening before the ministerial act of service, of a member needed for a quorum.” *Id.*

We recognize that in determining the timeliness of petitions for review of agency rules, we have concluded that “promulgation” takes place when a rule is published in the Federal Register. *See Horsehead Res. Dev. Co. v. EPA*, 130 F.3d 1090 (D.C. Cir. 1997); *Nat’l Grain & Feed Ass’n v. Occupational Safety & Health Admin.*, 845 F.2d 345 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (per curiam). But the question when a rule is eligible for judicial review is not the same as the question posed in this case—namely, what is the time for testing the validity of the Board’s rule. In *National Grain*, we distinguished between “issuance” and “promulgation” to determine the timeliness of a petition for review of an Occupational Safety and Health Administration standard. The statute provided for review of a standard “issued” under the statute no later than sixty days after the standard was “promulgated.” *Nat’l Grain & Feed Ass’n*, 845 F.2d at 345 (quoting 29 U.S.C. § 655(f)) (emphasis omitted). The agency’s regulations stated that a standard was issued when it was “officially filed in the Office of the Federal Register.” *Id.* (quoting 29 C.F.R. § 1911.18(d)). But the agency had not defined the term “promulgate,” and without a regulation equating the date of promulgation with the date of issuance, we declined the agency’s request to treat the terms as synonymous. *See id.* at 345–46.

We are not constrained by such statutory terms and need not determine when the Board's rule was "promulgated."<sup>7</sup> Our judgment is that the time of filing with the Office of the Federal Register is the appropriate time for determining whether the Board had a valid quorum. That the Board may have lost a quorum before its rule was published did not render its rule invalid.

## II

The parties devote a large part of their briefs to the question whether § 6 of the Act gave the Board authority to promulgate its posting rule. We will begin our analysis with a different provision—§ 8(c), which seems to us to control much of the case. Section 8(c) states:

The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed,

---

<sup>7</sup> Even within the Federal Register Act, the term "promulgated" seems to have different meanings in different contexts. *Compare* 44 U.S.C. § 1503 ("When the original [document required or authorized to be published] is issued, prescribed, or promulgated outside the District of Columbia, and certified copies are filed before the filing of the original, the notation shall be of the day and hour of filing of the certified copies."), *and id.* ("Every Federal agency shall cause to be transmitted for filing the original and the duplicate originals or certified copies of all such documents issued, prescribed, or promulgated by the agency."), *with id.* § 1505(c) ("In the event of an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States and a . . . [suspension of] all or part of the requirements of law or regulation for filing with the Office or publication in the Federal Register of documents or classes of documents[,] . . . [t]he President shall establish alternate systems for promulgating, filing, or publishing documents or classes of documents affected by such suspensions . . .").

graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this [Act], if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

29 U.S.C. § 158(c).

Before the enactment of § 8(c) in 1947, the Supreme Court had held that employers have free-speech rights under the First Amendment “to engage in noncoercive speech about unionization.” *Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. v. Brown*, 554 U.S. 60, 67 (2008). Believing that the Board was still “regulat[ing] employer speech too restrictively,” notwithstanding the Supreme Court’s decisions, *id.*, Congress enacted § 8(c) with its passage of the Taft-Hartley Act (more formally known as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947), Pub. L. No. 80-101, 61 Stat. 136. Section 8(c) “expressly precludes regulation of speech about unionization ‘so long as the communications do not contain a threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.’” *Chamber of Commerce*, 554 U.S. at 68 (quoting *NLRB v. Gissel Packing Co.*, 395 U.S. 575, 618 (1969)) (other internal quotation marks omitted).

“From one vantage,” the Court in *Chamber of Commerce* explained, “§ 8(c) ‘merely implements the First Amendment,’ in that it responded to particular constitutional rulings of the NLRB.” *Id.* at 67 (quoting *Gissel Packing*, 395 U.S. at 617). “But,” the Court added, § 8(c)’s “enactment also manifested a ‘congressional intent to encourage free debate on issues dividing labor and management.’” *Id.* (quoting *Linn v. Plant Guard Workers*, 383 U.S. 53, 62 (1966)). And it has been suggested that § 8(c) not only protects the right of free speech under the First Amendment, but also “serves a labor law function of allowing employers to present an alternative view and



information that a union would not present.” *Healthcare Ass’n of N.Y. State v. Pataki*, 471 F.3d 87, 98 (2d Cir. 2006).<sup>8</sup>

Although § 8(c) precludes the Board from finding noncoercive employer speech to be an unfair labor practice, or evidence of an unfair labor practice, the Board’s rule does both.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Whether § 8(c) is broader than the First Amendment—in, for example, prohibiting the Board from using noncoercive employer speech as evidence bearing on an unfair labor practice, *see* Archibald Cox, *Some Aspects of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947*, 61 HARV. L. REV. 1, 19 (1947)—is an issue we need not decide. Nor do we need to consider whether § 8(c) is narrower than the First Amendment in some respects. *See* Richard A. Epstein, *The Case Against the Free Choice Act* 26–27 (John M. Olin Law & Economics Working Paper No. 452 (2d series), 2009) (noting that § 8(c)’s final phrase—permitting speech only if it “contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit”—“has no analogy anywhere else in First Amendment law”). We also think it unimportant to this case that § 8(c) might be seen as a content-based regulation of labor speech, a matter of consequence in some First Amendment cases. *See Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 131 S. Ct. 2653 (2011); *Police Dep’t v. Mosley*, 408 U.S. 92 (1972). The parties have raised none of the issues these subjects would pose.

<sup>9</sup> The district court decided that § 104.214(b), the “anti-union animus” provision, was valid, even though the court thought plaintiffs had not “specifically” challenged the provision and had not made “an argument as to why that provision is invalid.” *Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 63 & n.26. But plaintiffs, in a supplemental statement filed before the court’s ruling, insisted that their amended complaint challenged the validity of the *entire* rule. And plaintiffs’ memorandum in support of their motion for summary judgment expressly argued not only that § 8(c) barred the Board from finding that an employer’s failure to post was an unfair labor practice, but also that the Board could not treat a failure to post as “proof of anti-union animus” on the part of an employer. Plaintiffs have sufficiently

Under the rule an employer's failure to post the required notice constitutes an unfair labor practice. *See* 29 C.F.R. §§ 104.210, 104.212.<sup>10</sup> And the Board may consider an employer's "knowing and willful" noncompliance to be "evidence of antiunion animus in cases in which unlawful motive [is] an element of an unfair labor practice." 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035–36; *see also* 29 C.F.R. § 104.214(b).<sup>11</sup> The Board, in other words, will use an employer's failure to post the notice as evidence of another unfair labor practice.

In the preamble to its rule, and in its argument to this court, the Board responds that it has not violated § 8(c) because the poster is the Board's speech, not the speech of any employer. After all, the Board says, the words on the poster are the Board's, and the last line of the poster warns: "This is an official Government Notice and must not be defaced by anyone." 29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app.<sup>12</sup>

It is obviously correct that the poster contains the Board's speech. It is also without question that the Board is free to post

---

preserved the same argument in their brief and reply brief in this court.

<sup>10</sup> We agree with the district court, *Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 52 n.15, that although § 104.210 states that the Board "may" find an employer's willful noncompliance to be an unfair labor practice, it is clear from § 104.213 and the preamble to the rule that "may" means "will." The Board has not argued otherwise.

<sup>11</sup> As examples of such unfair labor practices, the Board mentioned plant-closing threats, firings or refusals to hire, and interrogations of employees. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035–36 (citing cases); *see also* Cox, *supra*, 61 HARV. L. REV. at 19.

<sup>12</sup> The Board did not explain how it expected to enforce this warning.

the same message on its website, as it has done under the heading “Rights We Protect.” See NLRB, <http://www.nlr.gov/rights-we-protect> (last visited Apr. 25, 2013). We also assume that the Board may deliver its message directly to employees working for businesses over which the Board has jurisdiction. But we doubt whether calling the poster “Board speech” answers the question whether the rule violates § 8(c).

Our doubt stems, in part, from a comparison of § 8(c) with the law established under the First Amendment. We approach the question by considering some firmly established principles of First Amendment free-speech law. The first is that the “dissemination” of messages others have created is entitled to the same level of protection as the “creation” of messages. *Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 131 S. Ct. 2653, 2667 (2011). This is why there was no First Amendment difference between the free-speech rights of the publisher and the free-speech rights of the creators of the advertisement in *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964). It is why the First Amendment protects an individual’s disclosure of an illegally intercepted communication even though the individual did not participate in the communication (or in the illegal interception). See *Bartnicki v. Vopper*, 532 U.S. 514 (2001). It is also why those handing out leaflets prepared by others are exercising the First Amendment’s “freedom of speech.” See, e.g., *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105 (1943); *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444 (1938).

That § 8(c) embraces this principle is certain. The language of § 8(c) explicitly covers more than just the “expressing” of the speaker’s views. It covers as well the “dissemination” of “any views, argument, or opinion,” as long as the “written, printed, graphic, or visual” material disseminated is not coercive. 29 U.S.C. § 158(c).

Of course we are not faced with a regulation *forbidding* employers from disseminating information someone else has created. Instead, the Board's rule requires employers to disseminate such information, upon pain of being held to have committed an unfair labor practice. But that difference hardly ends the matter. The right to disseminate another's speech necessarily includes the right to decide not to disseminate it. First Amendment law acknowledges this apparent truth: "*all* speech inherently involves choices of what to say and what to leave unsaid." *Pac. Gas & Electric Co. v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 475 U.S. 1, 11 (1986) (plurality opinion).

Chief Justice Roberts, writing for a unanimous Court, put it this way in *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights, Inc.*: "Some of [the] Court's leading First Amendment precedents have established the principle that freedom of speech prohibits the government from telling people what they must say." 547 U.S. 47, 61 (2006). As examples, the Chief Justice cited *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943), and *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705 (1977).

In *Barnette* the Court held that "[t]o sustain the compulsory flag salute" and pledge of allegiance in public schools would be to conclude "that a Bill of Rights which guards the individual's right to speak his own mind, left it open to public authorities to compel him to utter what is not in his mind." 319 U.S. at 634.

*Wooley* held much the same: the First Amendment freedom of speech "includes both the right to speak freely and the right to refrain from speaking at all." 430 U.S. at 714. New Hampshire therefore could not coerce its citizens to display the State motto "Live Free or Die" on their automobile license plates, although presumably citizens could display it voluntarily. As the Supreme Court put it in *United States v. United Foods, Inc.*: "Just as the First Amendment may prevent government

from prohibiting speech, the Amendment may prevent the government from compelling individuals to express certain views . . .” 533 U.S., 405, 410 (2001); *see also* *Johanns v. Livestock Mktg. Ass’n*, 544 U.S. 550, 568 (2005) (Thomas, J., concurring); *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. Food & Drug Admin.*, 696 F.3d 1205, 1211 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

We do not think these, and other such cases, may be distinguished from this one on the Board’s terms. In *Barnette* and in *Wooley*, as in this case, the government selected the message and ordered its citizens to convey that message. The Supreme Court’s opinions do not suggest that because the messages were, to that extent, “government speech,” the First Amendment did not apply. And we do not think it matters that the Board has regulatory authority over the six million employers subject to its rule. In *Barnette* and *Wooley*, the state and local governments had regulatory authority over those (public school children and automobile drivers) it ordered to spread the message it selected. *See also* *United Foods*, 533 U.S. at 410; *R.J. Reynolds*, 696 F.3d at 1211.

The Board—in its brief, but not in the rulemaking—argues that this case is significantly different in light of the content of the poster. The poster, the Board’s acting general counsel tells us, merely recites the employee rights set forth in the National Labor Relations Act (and in court and Board interpretations of the Act). And so, the argument goes, this case is unlike *Barnette* or *Wooley* because the Board’s message is “non-ideological.” NLRB Br. 66. Even if we accepted the premise, the conclusion would not follow.

The right against compelled speech is not, and cannot be, restricted to ideological messages. Take for instance *Riley v. National Federation of the Blind of North Carolina, Inc.*, 487 U.S. 781 (1988). After recognizing that the First Amendment

protects “the decision of both what to say and what *not* to say,” the Court cited *Barnette* and *Wooley* in holding that these and other cases “cannot be distinguished simply because they involved compelled statements of opinion while here we deal with compelled statements of ‘fact.’” *Riley*, 487 U.S. at 797.<sup>13</sup> Yet that distinction, rejected in *Riley*, is precisely the distinction the Board’s acting general counsel urges us to adopt.

Plaintiffs here, like those in other compelled-speech cases, object to the message the government has ordered them to publish on their premises. They see the poster as one-sided, as favoring unionization, because it “fails to notify employees, *inter alia*, of their rights to decertify a union, to refuse to pay dues to a union in a right-to-work state, and to object to payment of dues in excess of the amounts required for representational purposes.” Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs. Br. 38; *see also* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,022 (discussing comments).<sup>14</sup> The Board responds that it was entitled to make “editorial judgments” about what to put in and what to leave out, NLRB Br. 68, and that “if an employer is concerned that employees will get the wrong impression, it may legally express its opinion regarding unionization as long as it

---

<sup>13</sup> In addition to *Barnette* and *Wooley*, the Court cited *Pacific Gas*, 475 U.S. 1 (plurality opinion), and *Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo*, 418 U.S. 241 (1974). The Supreme Court has thus recognized that its “compelled-speech cases” apply to situations “in which an individual must personally speak the government’s message,” as well as those in which one must “host or accommodate another speaker’s message.” *Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights*, 547 U.S. at 63; *see also Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Grp. of Boston*, 515 U.S. 557, 573–74 (1995).

<sup>14</sup> The Board seemed to accept plaintiffs’ contention that its poster must be even-handed. *See* NLRB Br. 68–69; 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,022.

does so in a noncoercive manner,” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,022.<sup>15</sup> Yet even in cases in which the message was other than one the government had devised, a “compelled-speech violation” occurred when “the complaining speaker’s own message was affected by the speech it was forced to accommodate.” *Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights*, 547 U.S. at 63.

This brings us to what the Board considers its strongest precedent—*UAW-Labor Employment & Training Corp. v. Chao*, 325 F.3d 360 (D.C. Cir. 2003). President Bush had issued an Executive Order requiring government contractors to post notices at their workplaces informing employees of their rights not to be forced to join a union or to pay union dues for non-representational activities. Three unions and the UAW brought suit (the UAW was a government contractor). They argued that the National Labor Relations Act preempted the Executive Order. *UAW*, 325 F.3d at 362. This was their only argument. They did not raise any “free-standing First Amendment claim.” *Id.* at 364. We therefore did not reach the question whether the posting requirement violated the contractors’ freedom of speech. As to § 8(c), the unions could not plausibly claim that the Executive Order violated this provision. The National Labor Relations Board was not in the picture. That is, there was no prospect of a contractor’s being charged with an unfair labor practice for failing to post the required notice.<sup>16</sup> As we put it,

---

<sup>15</sup> Although the poster identifies the Board as its author, it does not state that the employer had no choice but to display it. We suppose an employer could post a statement next to the poster pointing out its compulsory nature. *Cf. PruneYard Shopping Ctr. v. Robins*, 447 U.S. 74, 87 (1980).

<sup>16</sup> The Board held in *Rochester Manufacturing Co.*, 323 N.L.R.B. 260, 262 (1997), that employers do not commit unfair labor practices if they fail to inform their employees of their rights not to be forced to join a union or to pay union dues for non-representational activities.

“the activities described in § 8(c) do not ‘constitute an unfair labor practice,’ except by negation, and are not ‘protected by’ the NLRA, except from the [Board] itself.” *Id.* at 365 (emphasis omitted).

We acknowledged in *UAW* that “the right to speak” includes “the right not to speak.” *Id.* And we assumed, in light of the Supreme Court’s First Amendment decisions so holding, “that the § 8(c) right includes the right not to speak.” *Id.* But the § 8(c) right was only against the Board’s finding an unfair labor practice, or evidence thereof. Beyond that, “an employer’s right to silence is sharply constrained in the labor context, and leaves it subject to a variety of burdens to post notices of rights and risks.” *Id.*

In its preamble to the posting rule, the Board interpreted these passages to mean that under § 8(c) the Board may find that employers commit unfair labor practices if they fail to disseminate the Board’s message. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,013. The Board’s interpretation of our opinion was mistaken.<sup>17</sup> In mentioning constraints on employer silence “in the labor context,” we were not referring to an employer’s protection against—as we put it—“the NLRA itself.” *UAW*, 325 F.3d at 365. We were making a different point: that apart from the § 8(c) bar against unfair-labor-practice charges, the National Labor Relations Act did not give employers an unconstrained right to silence. The Second Circuit said much the same in

---

*See UAW*, 325 F.3d at 363.

<sup>17</sup> While an agency’s interpretation of its own precedent may be entitled to deference, *see Ceridian Corp. v. NLRB*, 435 F.3d 352, 355 (D.C. Cir. 2006), we owe no deference to an agency’s interpretation of judicial precedent, *see New York New York, LLC v. NLRB*, 313 F.3d 585, 590 (D.C. Cir. 2002).



*Healthcare Ass'n*, 471 F.3d at 98–100, another preemption case.<sup>18</sup>

We return then to the question with which we began. Suppose that § 8(c) prevents the Board from charging an employer with an unfair labor practice for posting a notice advising employees of their right not to join a union. Of course § 8(c) clearly does this. How then can it be an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to post a government notice informing employees of their right to unionize (or to refuse to)? Like the freedom of speech guaranteed in the First Amendment, § 8(c) necessarily protects—as against the Board, *see UAW*, 325 F.3d at 365—the right of employers (and unions) not to speak. This is why, for example, a company official giving a noncoercive speech to employees describing the disadvantages of unionization does not commit an unfair labor practice if, in his speech, the official neglects to mention the advantages of having a union.

---

<sup>18</sup> In a footnote to its brief, the Board states that its rule satisfies *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel of the Supreme Court of Ohio*, 471 U.S. 626, 651 (1985), but it does not explain why that decision has even the slightest bearing on this case. Under *Zauderer*, the government may, consistently with the First Amendment, require a party to a commercial transaction to make disclosures in order to prevent that party from deceiving its customers. *See R.J. Reynolds*, 696 F.3d at 1215. (The Board essentially followed the same reasoning in requiring unions to inform non-union employees of their right to limit the amount of dues and fees they pay to the unions under union-shop agreements. *See Rochester Mfg. Co.*, 323 N.L.R.B. 260 (1997); *California Saw & Knife Works*, 320 N.L.R.B. 224 (1995).) But that has nothing to do with this case. As we said earlier, no one—and certainly not the Board—has even suggested that the posting rule was needed because employers are misleading employees about their rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

We therefore conclude that the Board's rule violates § 8(c) because it makes an employer's failure to post the Board's notice an unfair labor practice, and because it treats such a failure as evidence of anti-union animus in cases involving, for example, unlawfully motivated firings or refusals to hire—in other words, because it treats such a failure as evidence of an unfair labor practice.<sup>19</sup> See *Brown & Root, Inc. v. NLRB*, 333 F.3d 628, 637–39 & n.7 (5th Cir. 2003).

### III

The Board's third method of enforcing its rule is to toll the Act's limitations period for filing unfair-labor-practice charges.<sup>20</sup> That time limit, added in 1947 as part of the Taft-Hartley Act, is set forth in § 10(b) of the Act: “no complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than six months prior to the filing of the charge with the Board and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom

---

<sup>19</sup> Our conclusion here does not affect the Board's rule requiring employers to post an election notice (which similarly contains information about employee rights) before a representation election, 29 C.F.R. § 103.20. Because the failure to post the required election notice does not constitute an unfair labor practice but may be a basis for setting aside the election, *see id.* § 103.20(d), the rule does not implicate § 8(c).

<sup>20</sup> The rule provides, in relevant part:  
When an employee files an unfair labor practice charge, the Board may find it appropriate to excuse the employee from the requirement that charges be filed within six months after the occurrence of the allegedly unlawful conduct if the employer has failed to post the required employee notice unless the employee has received actual or constructive notice that the conduct complained of is unlawful.  
29 C.F.R. § 104.214(a).

such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the armed forces, in which event the six-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge.” 29 U.S.C. § 160(b).

The tolling provision differs from the two other enforcement methods we have discussed. It does not treat an employer’s failure to post the notice as an unfair labor practice, or as evidence of one. The district court nevertheless enjoined the Board from enforcing the provision. The court ruled that the provision “substantially amends the statute of limitations that Congress expressly set out in the statute” and therefore “exceeds [the Board’s] statutory authority under *Chevron* step one.”<sup>21</sup> *Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 58. We agree.

The Board characterized this portion of its rule as providing for “equitable tolling.” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033. The Supreme Court’s decision in *Zipes v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 455 U.S. 385 (1982), the Board said, “strongly supports” its tolling rule. *Id.* We do not see it that way. *Zipes* held that the statutory time limit for charges under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(e), was a statute of limitations, not a jurisdictional requirement. *Zipes*, 455 U.S. at 393. Citing four cases from the courts of appeals, the Court analogized Title VII’s provision to § 10(b): “[T]he time requirement for filing an unfair labor practice charge under the National Labor Relations Act operates as a statute of limitations subject to recognized equitable doctrines and not as a restriction of the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, *see NLRB v. Local 264, Laborers’ Int’l Union*, 529 F.2d 778, 781–785 (CA8 1976); *Shumate v. NLRB*, 452 F.2d 717, 720 (CA4 1971); *NLRB v. A. E. Nettleton Co.*, 241 F.2d 130, 133 (CA2 1957); *NLRB v. Itasca*

---

<sup>21</sup> *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984).

*Cotton Mfg. Co.*, 179 F.2d 504, 506–507 (CA5 1950) . . .” *Id.* at 395 n.11. These four circuit court decisions held only that § 10(b) was not jurisdictional; none of the cases dealt with any equitable doctrines.

To derive support from *Zipes*, the Board must have thought that its tolling rule fell within one of the “recognized equitable doctrines.” *Id.* Yet the Board made no effort to demonstrate that when § 10(b) became law in 1947, Congress would have had any basis for assuming that the six-month limitations period might be modified by the sort of tolling rule the Board announced sixty-four years later. As we read the Supreme Court’s decisions dealing with tolling and other equitable modifications of statutes of limitations, that should have been the critical consideration. *See Gabelli v. SEC*, 133 S. Ct. 1216, 1220–24 (2013); *Credit Suisse Sec. (USA) LLC v. Simmonds*, 132 S. Ct. 1414, 1419–21 (2012); *John R. Sand & Gravel Co. v. United States*, 552 U.S. 130, 137–38 (2008); *Young v. United States*, 535 U.S. 43, 49–51 (2002); *TRW Inc. v. Andrews*, 534 U.S. 19, 27–31 (2001); *id.* at 37–39 (Scalia, J., concurring); *Rotella v. Wood*, 528 U.S. 549, 555–61 (2000); *Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson*, 501 U.S. 350, 363 (1991); *Irwin v. Dep’t of Veterans Affairs*, 498 U.S. 89, 95–96 (1990); *see also 3M Co. v. Browner*, 17 F.3d 1453, 1460–63 (D.C. Cir. 1994); Adam Bain & Ugo Colella, *Interpreting Federal Statutes of Limitations*, 37 CREIGHTON L. REV. 493 (2004); John F. Manning, *What Divides Textualists from Purposivists*, 106 COLUM. L. REV. 70, 81–82 & n.42 (2006).

We wrote in *3M*, in response to a federal agency’s argument for an “equitable” tolling exception to a statute of limitations, that we “are interpreting a statute, not creating some federal common law.” 17 F.3d at 1461. The key to interpreting a limitations statute and to determining the intent of Congress is whether the particular exception to a particular statute of

limitations was generally recognized when Congress enacted the statute. *See United States v. Kubrick*, 444 U.S. 111, 119–20 (1979). It is not enough that courts engaged in some sort of “equitable tolling” at the time Congress passed the limitations statute. “[D]ifferent types of equitable tolling . . . have been recognized at different times . . .” *Bain & Colella, supra*, 37 CREIGHTON L. REV. at 502. What matters is whether a particular basis for suspending the running of the statute of limitations had received judicial recognition when the statute became law. *See Credit Suisse Sec.*, 132 S. Ct. at 1421. After all, “Congress cannot intend to incorporate, by silence, various forms of equitable tolling that were not generally-recognized in the common law at the time of enactment.” *Bain & Colella, supra*, 37 CREIGHTON L. REV. at 503.

Thus, if a particular exception was generally recognized when Congress enacted the statute of limitations, a court may presume that Congress intended the same equitable exception to apply to the statute. If, on the other hand, the exception was not generally recognized at that time, a court could not presume that Congress intended it to suspend the running of the statutory period. *Cf. Meyer v. Holley*, 537 U.S. 280, 286 (2003) (“Congress’[s] silence, while permitting an inference that Congress intended to apply *ordinary* background tort principles, cannot show that it intended to apply an unusual modification of those rules.”).

Rather than following these legal principles, the Board relied on an analogy to the long-established equitable doctrine of fraudulent concealment.<sup>22</sup> *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033. This doctrine, which the Board has applied to toll the § 10(b)

---

<sup>22</sup> *See, e.g., Holmberg v. Armbrecht*, 327 U.S. 392 (1946); *Bailey v. Glover*, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 342 (1874).

limitations period,<sup>23</sup> has three elements: “fraudulent concealment tolls a statute of limitations when (1) there has been ‘deliberate concealment’ of (2) ‘material facts’ relating to the alleged wrongdoing and (3) the wronged party does not know of those facts and could not have discovered them through ‘reasonable diligence.’” *Int’l Ass’n of Machinists & Aerospace Workers v. NLRB*, 130 F.3d 1083, 1087 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (quoting *Fitzgerald v. Seaman*, 553 F.2d 220, 228 (D.C. Cir. 1977)); see also *Local Lodge No. 1424 v. NLRB*, 362 U.S. 411, 429 & n.19 (1960). The Board, using what it termed its “intuitive sense,” determined that even if the employee knew all the facts, in which event the fraudulent-concealment doctrine would not apply, the § 10(b) period could be suspended if the employee lacked knowledge of the law. 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033.

As Justice Scalia put it in a concurring opinion, this is “bad wine of recent vintage.” *TRW*, 534 U.S. at 37. The Board neglected to tie its theory to anything the 1947 Congress might have intended, and it contradicted the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Kubrick*, 444 U.S. 111. *Kubrick* argued that the limitations period in the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. § 2401(b)) should not begin running until he not only became aware of his injury but also learned of the law giving him a cause of action. In rejecting this argument, the Court refused to treat “a plaintiff’s ignorance of his legal rights” as if it were the same as “his ignorance of the fact of his injury,” *Kubrick*, 444 U.S. at 122, a point we relied upon in *3M*, 17 F.3d at 1461 n.14, when we rejected a similar argument.

The Board also cited a dozen or so circuit court and district court cases holding that an employer’s failure to post notices required by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and by the Age

---

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., *Don Burgess Constr. Corp.*, 227 N.L.R.B. 765 (1977), enforced, 596 F.2d 378 (9th Cir. 1979).

Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) warranted tolling. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033–34. We take no position on whether those cases were correctly decided in light of the line of Supreme Court decisions mentioned earlier.<sup>24</sup> Whatever their validity, the two earliest cases the Board cited were decided in 1977 and 1978, more than thirty years after Congress enacted § 10(b). And in one of those—*Kephart v. Inst. of Gas Tech.*, 581 F.2d 1287, 1289 (7th Cir. 1978)—the court rested its tolling decision on the intent of Congress as reflected in a Conference Committee report.<sup>25</sup>

The short of the matter is that the Board has not invoked any authority suggesting that the 1947 Congress intended to allow § 10(b) to be modified in the manner of the Board's tolling rule. Whether one frames the Board's tolling rule as resting on the employer's failure to post the Board's notice or on the charging employee's lack of knowledge of his rights under the National Labor Relations Act, the Board marshaled nothing to show that by 1947 this was a generally accepted basis for tolling limitations periods. We have already mentioned the Supreme Court's 1979 decision in *Kubrick*, which seems to us

---

<sup>24</sup> As the district court in this case stated, there appears to be a split in the circuits on the question whether failure to post under Title VII or the ADEA warrants tolling of the limitations period. *See Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 57 n.20.

<sup>25</sup> *Kephart*, 581 F. 2d at 1289, and several of the other cases the Board relied upon described tolling for failure to post a notice required by statute as a "penalty." *See Posey v. Skyline Corp.*, 702 F.2d 102, 104–05 (7th Cir. 1983); *Bonham v. Dresser Indus., Inc.*, 569 F.2d 187, 193 (3d Cir. 1977). The Board concedes that its authority is remedial only and that it may not exact penalties. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,031, 54,037. The Supreme Court has so held. *See Wis. Dep't of Indus., Labor & Human Relations v. Gould, Inc.*, 475 U.S. 282, 288 n.5 (1986).

at odds with the Board's approach. It is also noteworthy that a comprehensive—and widely cited—survey of the law of statutes of limitations, published only three years after enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, contains no mention of any equitable doctrine comparable to the one reflected in the Board's rule. *See Developments in the Law: Statutes of Limitations*, 63 HARV. L. REV. 1177 (1950).<sup>26</sup> Even today courts do not generally recognize lack of knowledge of the law as a basis for equitable tolling. Some of the more recent cases from the circuits, dealing with a wide variety of statutes, are set forth in the margin.<sup>27</sup> As the Tenth Circuit stated in a case dealing with the limitations period in the Railroad Retirement Act, 45 U.S.C. § 231h, “we are aware of no authority . . . which suggests that ignorance of the law should warrant equitable tolling of a statute of

---

<sup>26</sup> Before the *Harvard Law Review* study in 1950, the only comprehensive study of statutes of limitations in America was “the fourth edition of Wood's *Limitations* in 1916.” 63 HARV. L. REV. at 1177 (referring to H.G. WOOD, A TREATISE ON THE LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AT LAW AND IN EQUITY (Matthew Bender & Co. 4th ed. 1916)). This treatise makes clear that there was no recognized equitable doctrine permitting the tolling of a statute of limitations on the ground that the injured party did not know the law. *See* 2 WOOD, *supra*, § 276c(1), at 1408–11.

<sup>27</sup> *See, e.g., Josselyn v. Dennehy*, 475 F.3d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 2007); *Ormiston v. Nelson*, 117 F.3d 69, 72 n.5 (2d Cir. 1997); *United States v. Sosa*, 364 F.3d 507, 512 (4th Cir. 2004); *Fierro v. Cockrell*, 294 F.3d 674, 683 (5th Cir. 2002); *Graham-Humphreys v. Memphis Brooks Museum of Art, Inc.*, 209 F.3d 552, 561–62 (6th Cir. 2000); *Arrieta v. Battaglia*, 461 F.3d 861, 867 (7th Cir. 2006); *Frisby v. Milbank Mfg. Co.*, 688 F.3d 540, 544 (8th Cir. 2012) (Arkansas law); *Luna v. Holder*, 659 F.3d 753, 760 (9th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Denny*, 694 F.3d 1185, 1191 (10th Cir. 2012); *Jackson v. Astrue*, 506 F.3d 1349, 1356 (11th Cir. 2007); *United States v. Pollard*, 416 F.3d 48, 55 (D.C. Cir. 2005); *Shoshone Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation v. United States*, 672 F.3d 1021, 1032 (Fed. Cir. 2012).



limitations.” *Gatewood v. R.R. Retirement Bd.*, 88 F.3d 886, 890 (10th Cir. 1996).

We therefore hold that the Board’s tolling rule is contrary to § 10(b).

#### IV

Because all three of the means for enforcing the Board’s posting requirement are invalid, we do not decide whether, as plaintiffs also contend, the Board lacked the regulatory authority to issue subpart A of its rule—the requirement that employers post the notice specified in the appendix to that subpart. Subpart A clearly is not severable. *See MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Ass’n v. FCC*, 236 F.3d 13, 22–23 (D.C. Cir. 2001). “Severance and affirmance of a portion of an administrative regulation is improper if there is ‘substantial doubt’ that the agency would have adopted the severed portion on its own.” *Davis Cnty. Solid Waste Mgmt. v. EPA*, 108 F.3d 1454, 1459 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (per curiam) (quoting *North Carolina v. FERC*, 730 F.2d 790, 795–96 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (Scalia, J.)). If a reviewing court severed the regulation in that situation, it would be performing a function left to the agency. *See Fed. Power Comm’n v. Idaho Power Co.*, 344 U.S. 17, 20–21 (1952); *cf. Zuber v. Allen*, 402 F.2d 660, 674 (D.C. Cir. 1968).<sup>28</sup> Here we know that the Board would not have issued a posting rule that depended solely on voluntary compliance. We know this because the Board rejected that regulatory option in the preamble to its final rule. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,031. Subpart A must therefore fall along with the rest of the Board’s posting rule.

---

<sup>28</sup> Unlike in cases such as *Zuber* and *MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Ass’n*, in this case the Board did not include a severability clause in its rule and it did not include a statement on severability in its preamble to the final rule.

31

V

For the reasons stated, the Board's posting rule is vacated.

*Affirmed in part and reversed in part.*

#### ADDENDUM

##### Appendix to Subpart A—Text of Employee Notice

##### “EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) guarantees the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively with their employers, and to engage in other protected concerted activity or to refrain from engaging in any of the above activity. Employees covered by the NLRA\* are protected from certain types of employer and union misconduct. This Notice gives you general information about your rights, and about the obligations of employers and unions under the NLRA. Contact the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), the Federal agency that investigates and resolves complaints under the NLRA, using the contact information supplied below, if you have any questions about specific rights that may apply in your particular workplace.

“Under the NLRA, you have the right to:

- Organize a union to negotiate with your employer concerning your wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment.
- Form, join or assist a union.

- Bargain collectively through representatives of employees' own choosing for a contract with your employer setting your wages, benefits, hours, and other working conditions.

- Discuss your wages and benefits and other terms and conditions of employment or union organizing with your co-workers or a union.

- Take action with one or more co-workers to improve your working conditions by, among other means, raising work-related complaints directly with your employer or with a government agency, and seeking help from a union.

- Strike and picket, depending on the purpose or means of the strike or the picketing.

- Choose not to do any of these activities, including joining or remaining a member of a union.

“Under the NLRA, it is illegal for your employer to:

- Prohibit you from talking about or soliciting for a union during non-work time, such as before or after work or during break times; or from distributing union literature during non-work time, in non-work areas, such as parking lots or break rooms.

- Question you about your union support or activities in a manner that discourages you from engaging in that activity.

- Fire, demote, or transfer you, or reduce your hours or change your shift, or otherwise take adverse action against you, or threaten to take any of these actions, because you join or support a union, or because you engage in concerted activity for mutual aid and protection, or because you choose not to engage in any such activity.

- Threaten to close your workplace if workers choose a union to represent them.

- Promise or grant promotions, pay raises, or other benefits to discourage or encourage union support.

- Prohibit you from wearing union hats, buttons, t-shirts, and pins in the workplace except under special circumstances.

- Spy on or videotape peaceful union activities and gatherings or pretend to do so.

“Under the NLRA, it is illegal for a union or for the union that represents you in bargaining with your employer to:

- Threaten or coerce you in order to gain your support for the union.

- Refuse to process a grievance because you have criticized union officials or because you are not a member of the union.

- Use or maintain discriminatory standards or procedures in making job referrals from a hiring hall.

- Cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against you because of your union-related activity.

- Take adverse action against you because you have not joined or do not support the union.

“If you and your co-workers select a union to act as your collective bargaining representative, your employer and the union are required to bargain in good faith in a genuine effort to reach a written, binding agreement setting your terms and conditions of employment. The union is required to fairly represent you in bargaining and enforcing the agreement.

“Illegal conduct will not be permitted. If you believe your rights or the rights of others have been violated, you should contact the NLRB promptly to protect your rights, generally within six months of the unlawful activity. You may inquire about possible violations without your employer or anyone else being

informed of the inquiry. Charges may be filed by any person and need not be filed by the employee directly affected by the violation. The NLRB may order an employer to rehire a worker fired in violation of the law and to pay lost wages and benefits, and may order an employer or union to cease violating the law. Employees should seek assistance from the nearest regional NLRB office, which can be found on the Agency's Web site: <http://www.nlr.gov>.

You can also contact the NLRB by calling toll-free: 1-866-667-NLRB (6572) or (TTY) 1-866-315-NLRB (1-866-315-6572) for hearing impaired.

If you do not speak or understand English well, you may obtain a translation of this notice from the NLRB's Web site or by calling the toll-free numbers listed above.

“\*The National Labor Relations Act covers most private-sector employers. Excluded from coverage under the NLRA are public-sector employees, agricultural and domestic workers, independent contractors, workers employed by a parent or spouse, employees of air and rail carriers covered by the Railway Labor Act, and supervisors (although supervisors that have been discriminated against for refusing to violate the NLRA may be covered).

“This is an official Government Notice and must not be defaced by anyone.”

29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app.

KAREN LE CRAFT HENDERSON, with whom *Circuit Judge BROWN* joins, concurring:

I fully agree with Judge Randolph's analysis of NLRA section 8(c) and wholeheartedly concur in his well-reasoned opinion. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 158(c). Judge Brown and I would also hold, however, that the Board is without authority to promulgate the posting rule under NLRA section 6 as well—the issue Judge Randolph does not reach in light of his reliance on section 8(c). Section 6 provides: “The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by subchapter II of chapter 5 of Title 5, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subchapter.” 29 U.S.C. § 156. Such “general rulemaking authority,” although facially broad, “does not mean that the specific rule the agency promulgates is a valid exercise of that authority.” *Colo. River Indian Tribes v. Nat’l Indian Gaming Comm’n*, 466 F.3d 134, 139 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Here, I do not believe the posting rule—which creates a new species of unfair labor practice unforeshadowed in the NLRA’s text—constitutes a valid exercise of the Board’s section 6 authority because the rule is not, as section 6 requires, “necessary” to carry out the express provisions of the Act.

In the Final Rule, the Board claims the posting rule is necessary to carry out sections 1 and 7 of the NLRA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 151, 157. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,007 (§ 1); *id.* at 54,032 (§ 7). Section 1 consists of four paragraphs of general findings the Congress made to justify regulating the collective bargaining process in order to eliminate and mitigate “substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce,” 29 U.S.C. § 151. Section 7 sets out the general rights “as to organization, collective bargaining, etc. . . . [that e]mployees shall have,” *id.* § 157. Neither section contains any particularized “provision” that the Board can “carry out” by regulation or otherwise.\* In

---

\*In the only other challenge to a section 6 regulation, the United States Supreme Court upheld a regulation prescribing eight (and only

the past, we have rejected such a “general declaration of policy,” by itself, as authority for a specific regulation, observing that “[a]ll questions of government are ultimately questions of ends and means.’ ” *Colo. River Indian Tribes*, 466 F.3d at 139 (quoting *Fed’n of Fed. Emps. v. Greenberg*, 983 F.2d 286, 290 (D.C. Cir. 1993)). An agency, we have stated, is “bound, not only by the ultimate purposes Congress has selected, but by the means it has deemed appropriate, and prescribed, for the pursuit of those purposes.’ ” *Id.* at 139-40 (quoting *MCI Telecomms. Corp. v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 512 U.S. 218, 231 n.4 (1994)). And the Congress, in enacting the NLRA, prescribed that the Board use *reactive* means to enforce its policies—namely, through an unfair labor practice proceeding *initiated by a charging party* or by resolving representation and election issues *when so petitioned by a party*. See 29 U.S.C. § 160 (empowering Board “as *hereinafter provided*, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice” and thereafter providing “[w]henver it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such [ULP], the Board . . . shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges”), § 159 (authorizing Board to “investigate” a petition by employees or employer regarding representation and elections “[w]henver a petition shall have been filed, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board”), § 161 (setting out Board’s

---

eight) appropriate bargaining units for acute care hospitals—a regulation that was “necessary to carry out” the Board’s obligation under one of the *substantive* provisions of the Act, namely, section 9(b) (“The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this subchapter, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof . . . .” 29 U.S.C. § 159(b)). See *Am. Hosp. Ass’n v. NLRB*, 499 U.S. 609 (1991).

“Investigatory powers . . . [f]or the purpose of all hearings and investigations, which, in the opinion of the Board, *are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by sections 159 and 160*) (emphases added); *see also Republic Steel Corp. v. NLRB*, 311 U.S. 7, 10 (1940) (NLRA “is essentially remedial” and employee’s right thereunder “is safeguarded through the authority conferred upon the Board to require the employer to desist from the unfair labor practices described and to leave the employees free to organize and choose their representatives”); *Sure-Tan, Inc. v. NLRB*, 467 U.S. 883, 900 (1984) (“Quite early on, the Court established that ‘the relief which the statute empowers the Board to grant is to be adapted to the situation which calls for redress’ ” (quoting *NLRB v. Mackay Radio & Tel. Co.*, 304 U.S. 333, 348 (1938))).

The Final Rule also claims that, as a practical matter, the posting rule is “necessary” to ensure that employees know both what their rights are under the Act and that the Board protects those rights—thereby enabling employees to exercise them under the substantive provisions of the Act. It further asserts that the Board “has reason to think that most [employees] do not” have such knowledge given “the low percentage of employees who are represented by unions, . . . ; the increasing proportion of immigrants in the work force, who are unlikely to be familiar with their workplace rights; and lack of information about labor law and labor relations on the part of high school students who are about to enter the labor force”—citing as authority three law review articles. Final Rule, 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,006 & nn.3-4; *see also* Appellees/Cross-Appellants Br. 15-16. Even assuming these speculative assertions have some factual basis and, as well, that providing such information is “necessary to carry out” the Act’s provisions, there is nothing in the text of the NLRA to suggest the burden of filling the “knowledge gap” should fall on the employer’s shoulders. Unions and the NLRB are at least as qualified to disseminate appropriate information—easily and cheaply in this information



technology age—and in fact already do so. *See, e.g.*, <http://www.nlr.gov/rights-we-protect> (NLRB’s explanation of covered employee rights, its protection of concerted activity, employer and employee reciprocal rights and obligations and its jurisdiction over private employers). The NLRA—and section 6 in particular—simply does not authorize the Board to impose on an employer a freestanding obligation to educate its employees on the fine points of labor relations law. *See Chamber of Commerce of U.S. v. NLRB*, 856 F. Supp. 2d 778, 792 n.13 (D.S.C. 2012) (“Here, the Board’s interpretation of Section 6 as authorizing the rule does not incorporate any labor-related expertise. *See Hi-Craft Clothing Co. [v. NLRB]*, 660 F.2d [910,] 918[ (3d Cir. 1981)] (“This is not a question of the Board applying a broad statutory term to a specified set of facts, but is a case of straightforward statutory construction.’”).

In sum, given the Act’s language and structure are manifestly remedial, I do not believe the Congress intended to authorize a regulation so aggressively prophylactic as the posting rule. *Accord Chamber of Commerce*, 856 F. Supp. 2d at 790-92; *see Amalgamated Transit Union v. Skinner*, 894 F.2d 1362, 1364 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (“Where Congress prescribes the form in which an agency may exercise its authority, . . . we cannot elevate the goals of an agency’s action, however reasonable, over that prescribed form.”).

**ADDENDUM**

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

Argued September 11, 2012

Decided May 7, 2013

No. 12-5068

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, ET AL.,  
APPELLANTS/CROSS-APPELLEES

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, ET AL.,  
APPELLEES/CROSS-APPELLANTS

---

Consolidated with 12-5138

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia  
(No. 1:11-cv-01629)

---

*Maurice Baskin* argued the cause for appellants/cross-appellees. With him on the briefs were *Peter N. Kirsanow*, *Bryan Schwartz*, *Maynard Buck*, *Patrick O. Peters*, *Glenn M. Taubman*, *William L. Messenger*, *John N. Raudabaugh*, and *H. Christopher Bartolomucci*. *William G. Miozzi* entered an appearance.

*Doreen S. Davis*, *Charles I. Cohen*, *Jonathan C. Fritts*, and *David R. Broderdorf* were on the brief for *amici curiae* The Honorable John Kline, Chairman, Committee of Education and

the Workforce, The House of Representatives, et al. in support of appellants/cross-appellees.

*Dawn L. Goldstein*, Attorney, National Labor Relations Board, argued the cause for appellees/cross-appellants. With her on the briefs were *John H. Ferguson*, Associate General Counsel, *Margery E. Lieber*, Deputy Associate General Counsel, *Eric G. Moskowitz*, Assistant General Counsel, *Abby Propis Simms*, Deputy Assistant General Counsel, and *Kevin P. Flanagan*, Attorney. *Linda Dreeben*, Deputy Associate General Counsel, entered an appearance.

*Lynn Rhinehart*, *Charles J. Morris*, *Christine L. Owens*, and *Walter Kamiat* were on the brief for *amici curiae* Professor Charles J. Morris, et al. in support of appellees/cross-appellants.

Before: HENDERSON and BROWN, *Circuit Judges*, and RANDOLPH, *Senior Circuit Judge*.

Opinion for the Court filed by *Senior Circuit Judge* RANDOLPH.

Concurring opinion filed by *Circuit Judge* HENDERSON, with whom *Circuit Judge* BROWN joins.

RANDOLPH, *Senior Circuit Judge*: The National Labor Relations Board declared in a rule that employers subject to its jurisdiction would be guilty of an unfair labor practice if they did not post on their properties and on their websites a “Notification of Employee Rights under the National Labor Relations Act.” 76 Fed. Reg. 54,006 (Aug. 30, 2011). The rule applies to “nearly 6 million” employers, “the great majority” of which are small businesses. *Id.* at 54,042–43. Trade associations and other organizations representing employers across the country filed complaints in the district court, claiming that the

Board's rule violated the National Labor Relations Act and the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The Board's action departs from its historic practice. From its inception in 1935, the Board has exhibited a "negative attitude" toward setting down principles in rulemaking, rather than adjudication. *Bell Aerospace Co. v. NLRB*, 475 F.2d 485, 496 (2d Cir. 1973) (Friendly, J.), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 416 U.S. 267 (1974); *see also* R. Alexander Acosta, *Rebuilding the Board: An Argument for Structural Change, Over Policy Prescriptions, at the NLRB*, 5 FIU L. REV. 347, 351 (2010); Jeffrey S. Lubbers, *The Potential of Rulemaking by the NLRB*, 5 FIU L. REV. 411 (2010). Despite its "broad" rulemaking authority under § 6 of the National Labor Relations Act, *Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. NLRB*, 499 U.S. 606, 613 (1991), the Board had "used rulemaking as a means of announcing—or considering—its policies on only a few occasions" until 1989, the year in which it issued the substantive regulation upheld in *American Hospital*, ROBERT A. GORMAN & MATTHEW W. FINKIN, BASIC TEXT ON LABOR LAW: UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING 21 (2d ed. 2004).

The path leading to the posting rule goes back to 1993 when a law professor petitioned the Board. *See* 75 Fed. Reg. 80,410, 80,411 (Dec. 22, 2010). Despite prodding from this law professor and, later, several others, the Board declined to act. Then, in 2010, the Board issued a notice of proposed rulemaking. *Id.* at 80,410. After receiving more than 7000 comments, the Board published a final rule on August 30, 2011, with Member Hayes dissenting. 76 Fed. Reg. 54,006.

The final rule provides that "[a]ll employers subject to the NLRA must post notices to employees, in conspicuous places, informing them of their NLRA rights, together with Board contact information and information concerning basic

enforcement procedures, in the language set forth in the Appendix to Subpart A of this part.” 29 C.F.R. § 104.202(a). In addition, employers who customarily communicate with their employees electronically must publish the Board’s notice on their intranet or internet sites. *See id.* § 104.202(f). The required poster, which is published as an addendum to this opinion, must be at least 11 inches by 17 inches and in a type size and format the Board prescribes. *See id.* § 104.202(b). The poster informs employees of their right to form, join, or assist a union; to bargain collectively through representatives of their choosing; to discuss wages, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment with fellow employees or a union; to take action to improve working conditions; to strike and picket; or to choose not to engage in any of these activities. *See* 29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app. The poster also recites more specific employee rights the Board derived from judicial and Board interpretations of the Act. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,018.<sup>1</sup> The poster states, for example, that it is “illegal” for an employer to prohibit employees “from wearing union hats, buttons, t-shirts, and pins in the workplace” or to “[s]py on or videotape peaceful union activities and gatherings or pretend to do so.” 29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app. The poster also states that it is “illegal” for a union to “[t]hreaten or coerce [an employee] in order to gain . . . support for the union” or to “[r]efuse to process a grievance because [the employee] ha[s] criticized union officials or . . . [is] not a member of the union.” *Id.*

As an enforcement mechanism, the rule declares that an employer’s failure to post the notice is an unfair labor practice—that is, it “may be found to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed by

---

<sup>1</sup> The final rule states that if the law developed by the courts or the Board changes, the Board may—by “rules, regulations, or orders”—alter the poster’s content. 29 C.F.R. § 104.202(c).

NLRA Section 7, 29 U.S.C. 157, in violation of NLRA Section 8(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(1).” 29 C.F.R. § 104.210.

Section 7 of the Act provides that employees

shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in [section 8(a)(3) of the Act].

29 U.S.C. § 157. (Under § 8(a)(1) it is an “unfair labor practice” for an employer “to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in [section 7 of the Act].” *Id.* § 158(a)(1).)

The rule contains two additional enforcement devices. The Board may suspend the running of the six-month limitations period for filing any unfair-labor-practice charge under § 10(b), 29 U.S.C. § 160(b), “unless the employee has received actual or constructive notice that the conduct complained of is unlawful.” 29 C.F.R. § 104.214(a). And the Board may consider an employer’s “knowing and willful refusal to comply with the requirement to post the employee notice as evidence of unlawful motive in a case in which motive is an issue.” *Id.* § 104.214(b).

The Board invoked § 6 of the Act as authority for the rule. That section provides that the “Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner

prescribed by [the Administrative Procedure Act], such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions” of the Act. 29 U.S.C. § 156. The Board thought the rule was necessary because employees were not aware of their rights under the Act. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,006. The Board offered three reasons why: unions now represent only a small percentage of the private workforce, by the latest count just 7.3 percent;<sup>2</sup> immigrants make up “an increasing proportion of the nation’s work force” and “are unlikely to be familiar with their workplace rights”; and many high-school students about to enter the work force are not familiar with labor laws. 75 Fed. Reg. at 80,411.

“Enforcement of the NLRA,” the Board stated, “depend[s] on the existence of outside actors who are not only aware of their rights but also know where they may seek to vindicate them within appropriate timeframes.” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,010. By this, the Board meant that unfair-labor-practice cases must begin with a charge filed by an employee or a union or an employer. “The charge triggers an inquiry that may (or may not) result in the issuance of a *complaint* by the Board . . . . However, neither the Board nor its agents are authorized to institute charges *sua sponte*.” GORMAN & FINKIN, BASIC TEXT ON LABOR LAW, *supra*, at 10. Board orders finding an unfair labor practice after proceedings on a complaint are “not self-executing.” *Id.* at 14. Rather, the Board must petition a court of appeals for enforcement—that is, for a court order requiring the offending party to comply with the Board’s order. *See id.*

---

<sup>2</sup> The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that unions represented 7.3 percent of private-sector employees in 2012. Press Release, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Union Members—2012 (table 3) (Jan. 23, 2013), *available at* <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/union2.pdf>.



Member Hayes, dissenting, disputed both the Board's authority under § 6 and the evidentiary support the Board majority relied upon in concluding the posting rule was needed. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,037–42.

On cross-motions for summary judgment, the district court ruled as follows. The court first decided that the Board had the authority, under § 6 of the Act, to promulgate the posting rule. *See Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. NLRB*, 846 F. Supp. 2d 34, 48 (D.D.C. 2012). Citing *Mourning v. Family Publications Service, Inc.*, 411 U.S. 356, 369 (1973), and other decisions, the court determined that the rule was reasonably related to the purposes of the Act, and that the plaintiffs' contrary arguments, based mainly on the Act's legislative history, were unpersuasive. *See id.* at 43–48. But citing § 8(a)(1) and § 8(c), of which more hereafter, the court ruled that the Board had no authority to make a “blanket advance determination that a failure to post will always constitute an unfair labor practice,” although the court did not preclude such a finding in an individual case. *Id.* at 54–55. The district court also held invalid the section of the rule tolling the § 10(b) limitations period if the employer failed to post the notice. Whether there should be tolling, the court ruled, depended on equitable considerations that had to be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* at 55–58. As to the part of the rule that permitted an employer's failure to post to be considered as evidence of an improper motive, the court asserted, first, that plaintiffs had not made a specific argument against this provision, and second, that even if they had done so, the court would uphold it because “the Rule does not make a blanket finding that will govern future individual adjudications or create a presumption of anti-union animus whenever an employer fails to post the provision.” *Id.* at 63 & n.26.

Having determined that two of the rule's provisions were invalid, the court turned to the question whether the entire rule

should fall. The court held that the Board would have wanted the posting requirement to stand even if two of three means of enforcing it were invalid. *See id.* at 61–63.

The case is here on plaintiffs' appeal and the Board's cross-appeal.<sup>3</sup>

One month after the district court issued its opinion, the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina held that the Board lacked authority to promulgate the rule. *See Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. v. NLRB*, 856 F. Supp. 2d 778 (D.S.C. 2012). The appeal in that case is now pending before the Fourth Circuit.

## I

Although the parties have not raised it, one issue needs to be resolved before we turn to the merits of the case. After oral argument in this case, we held that a recess appointment is constitutionally valid only if the appointment is made during an intersession recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy that arose during that same intersession recess. *See Noel Canning v. NLRB*, 705 F.3d 490, 506, 512, 514 (D.C. Cir. 2013). The Board had four members when the Federal Register published the proposed notice-posting rule on December 22, 2010. Three members, Wilma B. Liebman, Mark G. Pearce, and Brian Hayes, were confirmed by the Senate. *See* 156 CONG. REC. S5281 (daily ed. June 22, 2010) (Pearce and Hayes); 152 CONG. REC. S8906–07

---

<sup>3</sup> On April 17, 2012, a panel of this court granted plaintiffs' motion for a stay of the rule pending these appeals. *See Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs. v. NLRB*, No. 12-5068, 2012 WL 4328371 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 17, 2012) (unpublished order).

(daily ed. Aug. 3, 2006) (Liebman).<sup>4</sup> The fourth member, Craig Becker, was appointed by the President on March 27, 2010, during an intrasession recess of the Senate. To the extent that *Noel Canning* applies—we assume, without deciding, that it does—Becker’s appointment was constitutionally invalid.

The Board can lawfully act with a quorum of three members. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 153(b); *New Process Steel, L.P. v. NLRB*, 130 S. Ct. 2635, 2640 (2010). Chairman Liebman’s term expired on August 27, 2011. Her seat was not immediately filled. That left the Board without a valid quorum by the time the final rule was published in the Federal Register on August 30, 2011. But assuming, again without deciding, that the existence of a valid quorum is a jurisdictional issue or that we otherwise may exercise our discretion to raise the issue *sua sponte*, we see no problem here.

The Federal Register Act requires a regulation (or other document) to be filed with the Office of the Federal Register before it is published in the Federal Register. *See* 44 U.S.C. § 1503.<sup>5</sup> The date and time of filing is noted on the document, and upon filing, a copy of the document is immediately available for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register, even though the document will not be published until

---

<sup>4</sup> Wilma Liebman had been confirmed on November 8, 1997, for the remainder of the term that expired on December 16, 1997, and for a term that expired on December 16, 2002, *see* 143 CONG. REC. S12,214 (daily ed. Nov. 8, 1997), and on November 14, 2002, for a term that expired on August 27, 2006, *see* 148 CONG. REC. S11,031 (daily ed. Nov. 14, 2002).

<sup>5</sup> Receipt of the document by the Office does not constitute “filing.” Rather, a document is filed for public inspection “only after it has been received, processed and assigned a publication date.” 1 C.F.R. § 17.2(a).

later. *See id.*<sup>6</sup> The Federal Register Act further provides that the filing of a document required to be published in the Federal Register constitutes constructive notice to anyone subject to or affected by it. *See* 44 U.S.C. § 1507.

In light of these provisions, we believe the date of filing is the relevant time for determining whether the Board had a valid quorum. Chairman Liebman signed the final rule on August 22, 2011, and the rule was filed with the Office of the Federal Register on August 25, 2011, before her term expired, when the Board still had a constitutionally appointed quorum. Once the rule was filed with the Office of the Federal Register, the Board had taken all the steps necessary to issue the rule—there was nothing left for the Board to do. All that remained was for the rule to be published in the Federal Register, but that was in the hands of the Office of the Federal Register.

The Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice has also taken the view that, for purposes of determining whether an agency has complied with a statutory deadline for issuing regulations, promulgation takes place when the final regulations are filed with the Office of the Federal Register, regardless of when the regulations are published in the Federal Register. *See* Federal Register Act—Date of “Promulgation” of Law Enforcement Assistance Admin. Regs., 1 Op. O.L.C. 12 (1977).

We employed similar reasoning in *Braniff Airways, Inc. v. Civil Aeronautics Board*, when we concluded that an order of the Civil Aeronautics Board was valid even though the chairman resigned and the Board thereby lost a quorum between the time

---

<sup>6</sup> Documents are also posted to the Office’s website. *See* Electronic Public Inspection Desk, Office of the Federal Register, <http://www.ofr.gov/inspection.aspx>.

the order was signed and entered and the time it was served on the parties. *See* 379 F.2d 453, 459 (D.C. Cir. 1967). Although the Aeronautics Board had stated that “a ‘proposed decision of the Board does not become effective until an opinion and order . . . has been approved, issued, and served,’” our view was that “once all members have voted for an award and caused it to be issued the order is not nullified because of incapacity, intervening before the ministerial act of service, of a member needed for a quorum.” *Id.*

We recognize that in determining the timeliness of petitions for review of agency rules, we have concluded that “promulgation” takes place when a rule is published in the Federal Register. *See Horsehead Res. Dev. Co. v. EPA*, 130 F.3d 1090 (D.C. Cir. 1997); *Nat’l Grain & Feed Ass’n v. Occupational Safety & Health Admin.*, 845 F.2d 345 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (per curiam). But the question when a rule is eligible for judicial review is not the same as the question posed in this case—namely, what is the time for testing the validity of the Board’s rule. In *National Grain*, we distinguished between “issuance” and “promulgation” to determine the timeliness of a petition for review of an Occupational Safety and Health Administration standard. The statute provided for review of a standard “issued” under the statute no later than sixty days after the standard was “promulgated.” *Nat’l Grain & Feed Ass’n*, 845 F.2d at 345 (quoting 29 U.S.C. § 655(f)) (emphasis omitted). The agency’s regulations stated that a standard was issued when it was “officially filed in the Office of the Federal Register.” *Id.* (quoting 29 C.F.R. § 1911.18(d)). But the agency had not defined the term “promulgate,” and without a regulation equating the date of promulgation with the date of issuance, we declined the agency’s request to treat the terms as synonymous. *See id.* at 345–46.

We are not constrained by such statutory terms and need not determine when the Board's rule was "promulgated."<sup>7</sup> Our judgment is that the time of filing with the Office of the Federal Register is the appropriate time for determining whether the Board had a valid quorum. That the Board may have lost a quorum before its rule was published did not render its rule invalid.

## II

The parties devote a large part of their briefs to the question whether § 6 of the Act gave the Board authority to promulgate its posting rule. We will begin our analysis with a different provision—§ 8(c), which seems to us to control much of the case. Section 8(c) states:

The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed,

---

<sup>7</sup> Even within the Federal Register Act, the term "promulgated" seems to have different meanings in different contexts. *Compare* 44 U.S.C. § 1503 ("When the original [document required or authorized to be published] is issued, prescribed, or promulgated outside the District of Columbia, and certified copies are filed before the filing of the original, the notation shall be of the day and hour of filing of the certified copies."), *and id.* ("Every Federal agency shall cause to be transmitted for filing the original and the duplicate originals or certified copies of all such documents issued, prescribed, or promulgated by the agency."), *with id.* § 1505(c) ("In the event of an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States and a . . . [suspension of] all or part of the requirements of law or regulation for filing with the Office or publication in the Federal Register of documents or classes of documents[,] . . . [t]he President shall establish alternate systems for promulgating, filing, or publishing documents or classes of documents affected by such suspensions . . .").

graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this [Act], if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

29 U.S.C. § 158(c).

Before the enactment of § 8(c) in 1947, the Supreme Court had held that employers have free-speech rights under the First Amendment “to engage in noncoercive speech about unionization.” *Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. v. Brown*, 554 U.S. 60, 67 (2008). Believing that the Board was still “regulat[ing] employer speech too restrictively,” notwithstanding the Supreme Court’s decisions, *id.*, Congress enacted § 8(c) with its passage of the Taft-Hartley Act (more formally known as the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947), Pub. L. No. 80-101, 61 Stat. 136. Section 8(c) “expressly precludes regulation of speech about unionization ‘so long as the communications do not contain a threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.’” *Chamber of Commerce*, 554 U.S. at 68 (quoting *NLRB v. Gissel Packing Co.*, 395 U.S. 575, 618 (1969)) (other internal quotation marks omitted).

“From one vantage,” the Court in *Chamber of Commerce* explained, “§ 8(c) ‘merely implements the First Amendment,’ in that it responded to particular constitutional rulings of the NLRB.” *Id.* at 67 (quoting *Gissel Packing*, 395 U.S. at 617). “But,” the Court added, § 8(c)’s “enactment also manifested a ‘congressional intent to encourage free debate on issues dividing labor and management.’” *Id.* (quoting *Linn v. Plant Guard Workers*, 383 U.S. 53, 62 (1966)). And it has been suggested that § 8(c) not only protects the right of free speech under the First Amendment, but also “serves a labor law function of allowing employers to present an alternative view and

information that a union would not present.” *Healthcare Ass’n of N.Y. State v. Pataki*, 471 F.3d 87, 98 (2d Cir. 2006).<sup>8</sup>

Although § 8(c) precludes the Board from finding noncoercive employer speech to be an unfair labor practice, or evidence of an unfair labor practice, the Board’s rule does both.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Whether § 8(c) is broader than the First Amendment—in, for example, prohibiting the Board from using noncoercive employer speech as evidence bearing on an unfair labor practice, *see* Archibald Cox, *Some Aspects of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947*, 61 HARV. L. REV. 1, 19 (1947)—is an issue we need not decide. Nor do we need to consider whether § 8(c) is narrower than the First Amendment in some respects. *See* Richard A. Epstein, *The Case Against the Free Choice Act* 26–27 (John M. Olin Law & Economics Working Paper No. 452 (2d series), 2009) (noting that § 8(c)’s final phrase—permitting speech only if it “contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit”—“has no analogy anywhere else in First Amendment law”). We also think it unimportant to this case that § 8(c) might be seen as a content-based regulation of labor speech, a matter of consequence in some First Amendment cases. *See Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 131 S. Ct. 2653 (2011); *Police Dep’t v. Mosley*, 408 U.S. 92 (1972). The parties have raised none of the issues these subjects would pose.

<sup>9</sup> The district court decided that § 104.214(b), the “anti-union animus” provision, was valid, even though the court thought plaintiffs had not “specifically” challenged the provision and had not made “an argument as to why that provision is invalid.” *Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 63 & n.26. But plaintiffs, in a supplemental statement filed before the court’s ruling, insisted that their amended complaint challenged the validity of the *entire* rule. And plaintiffs’ memorandum in support of their motion for summary judgment expressly argued not only that § 8(c) barred the Board from finding that an employer’s failure to post was an unfair labor practice, but also that the Board could not treat a failure to post as “proof of anti-union animus” on the part of an employer. Plaintiffs have sufficiently



Under the rule an employer's failure to post the required notice constitutes an unfair labor practice. *See* 29 C.F.R. §§ 104.210, 104.212.<sup>10</sup> And the Board may consider an employer's "knowing and willful" noncompliance to be "evidence of antiunion animus in cases in which unlawful motive [is] an element of an unfair labor practice." 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035–36; *see also* 29 C.F.R. § 104.214(b).<sup>11</sup> The Board, in other words, will use an employer's failure to post the notice as evidence of another unfair labor practice.

In the preamble to its rule, and in its argument to this court, the Board responds that it has not violated § 8(c) because the poster is the Board's speech, not the speech of any employer. After all, the Board says, the words on the poster are the Board's, and the last line of the poster warns: "This is an official Government Notice and must not be defaced by anyone." 29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app.<sup>12</sup>

It is obviously correct that the poster contains the Board's speech. It is also without question that the Board is free to post

---

preserved the same argument in their brief and reply brief in this court.

<sup>10</sup> We agree with the district court, *Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 52 n.15, that although § 104.210 states that the Board "may" find an employer's willful noncompliance to be an unfair labor practice, it is clear from § 104.213 and the preamble to the rule that "may" means "will." The Board has not argued otherwise.

<sup>11</sup> As examples of such unfair labor practices, the Board mentioned plant-closing threats, firings or refusals to hire, and interrogations of employees. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,035–36 (citing cases); *see also* Cox, *supra*, 61 HARV. L. REV. at 19.

<sup>12</sup> The Board did not explain how it expected to enforce this warning.

the same message on its website, as it has done under the heading “Rights We Protect.” See NLRB, <http://www.nlr.gov/rights-we-protect> (last visited Apr. 25, 2013). We also assume that the Board may deliver its message directly to employees working for businesses over which the Board has jurisdiction. But we doubt whether calling the poster “Board speech” answers the question whether the rule violates § 8(c).

Our doubt stems, in part, from a comparison of § 8(c) with the law established under the First Amendment. We approach the question by considering some firmly established principles of First Amendment free-speech law. The first is that the “dissemination” of messages others have created is entitled to the same level of protection as the “creation” of messages. *Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 131 S. Ct. 2653, 2667 (2011). This is why there was no First Amendment difference between the free-speech rights of the publisher and the free-speech rights of the creators of the advertisement in *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964). It is why the First Amendment protects an individual’s disclosure of an illegally intercepted communication even though the individual did not participate in the communication (or in the illegal interception). See *Bartnicki v. Vopper*, 532 U.S. 514 (2001). It is also why those handing out leaflets prepared by others are exercising the First Amendment’s “freedom of speech.” See, e.g., *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105 (1943); *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444 (1938).

That § 8(c) embraces this principle is certain. The language of § 8(c) explicitly covers more than just the “expressing” of the speaker’s views. It covers as well the “dissemination” of “any views, argument, or opinion,” as long as the “written, printed, graphic, or visual” material disseminated is not coercive. 29 U.S.C. § 158(c).

Of course we are not faced with a regulation *forbidding* employers from disseminating information someone else has created. Instead, the Board's rule requires employers to disseminate such information, upon pain of being held to have committed an unfair labor practice. But that difference hardly ends the matter. The right to disseminate another's speech necessarily includes the right to decide not to disseminate it. First Amendment law acknowledges this apparent truth: "*all* speech inherently involves choices of what to say and what to leave unsaid." *Pac. Gas & Electric Co. v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 475 U.S. 1, 11 (1986) (plurality opinion).

Chief Justice Roberts, writing for a unanimous Court, put it this way in *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights, Inc.*: "Some of [the] Court's leading First Amendment precedents have established the principle that freedom of speech prohibits the government from telling people what they must say." 547 U.S. 47, 61 (2006). As examples, the Chief Justice cited *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943), and *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705 (1977).

In *Barnette* the Court held that "[t]o sustain the compulsory flag salute" and pledge of allegiance in public schools would be to conclude "that a Bill of Rights which guards the individual's right to speak his own mind, left it open to public authorities to compel him to utter what is not in his mind." 319 U.S. at 634.

*Wooley* held much the same: the First Amendment freedom of speech "includes both the right to speak freely and the right to refrain from speaking at all." 430 U.S. at 714. New Hampshire therefore could not coerce its citizens to display the State motto "Live Free or Die" on their automobile license plates, although presumably citizens could display it voluntarily. As the Supreme Court put it in *United States v. United Foods, Inc.*: "Just as the First Amendment may prevent government

from prohibiting speech, the Amendment may prevent the government from compelling individuals to express certain views . . .” 533 U.S., 405, 410 (2001); *see also* *Johanns v. Livestock Mktg. Ass’n*, 544 U.S. 550, 568 (2005) (Thomas, J., concurring); *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. Food & Drug Admin.*, 696 F.3d 1205, 1211 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

We do not think these, and other such cases, may be distinguished from this one on the Board’s terms. In *Barnette* and in *Wooley*, as in this case, the government selected the message and ordered its citizens to convey that message. The Supreme Court’s opinions do not suggest that because the messages were, to that extent, “government speech,” the First Amendment did not apply. And we do not think it matters that the Board has regulatory authority over the six million employers subject to its rule. In *Barnette* and *Wooley*, the state and local governments had regulatory authority over those (public school children and automobile drivers) it ordered to spread the message it selected. *See also* *United Foods*, 533 U.S. at 410; *R.J. Reynolds*, 696 F.3d at 1211.

The Board—in its brief, but not in the rulemaking—argues that this case is significantly different in light of the content of the poster. The poster, the Board’s acting general counsel tells us, merely recites the employee rights set forth in the National Labor Relations Act (and in court and Board interpretations of the Act). And so, the argument goes, this case is unlike *Barnette* or *Wooley* because the Board’s message is “non-ideological.” NLRB Br. 66. Even if we accepted the premise, the conclusion would not follow.

The right against compelled speech is not, and cannot be, restricted to ideological messages. Take for instance *Riley v. National Federation of the Blind of North Carolina, Inc.*, 487 U.S. 781 (1988). After recognizing that the First Amendment

protects “the decision of both what to say and what *not* to say,” the Court cited *Barnette* and *Wooley* in holding that these and other cases “cannot be distinguished simply because they involved compelled statements of opinion while here we deal with compelled statements of ‘fact.’” *Riley*, 487 U.S. at 797.<sup>13</sup> Yet that distinction, rejected in *Riley*, is precisely the distinction the Board’s acting general counsel urges us to adopt.

Plaintiffs here, like those in other compelled-speech cases, object to the message the government has ordered them to publish on their premises. They see the poster as one-sided, as favoring unionization, because it “fails to notify employees, *inter alia*, of their rights to decertify a union, to refuse to pay dues to a union in a right-to-work state, and to object to payment of dues in excess of the amounts required for representational purposes.” Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs. Br. 38; *see also* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,022 (discussing comments).<sup>14</sup> The Board responds that it was entitled to make “editorial judgments” about what to put in and what to leave out, NLRB Br. 68, and that “if an employer is concerned that employees will get the wrong impression, it may legally express its opinion regarding unionization as long as it

---

<sup>13</sup> In addition to *Barnette* and *Wooley*, the Court cited *Pacific Gas*, 475 U.S. 1 (plurality opinion), and *Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo*, 418 U.S. 241 (1974). The Supreme Court has thus recognized that its “compelled-speech cases” apply to situations “in which an individual must personally speak the government’s message,” as well as those in which one must “host or accommodate another speaker’s message.” *Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights*, 547 U.S. at 63; *see also Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Grp. of Boston*, 515 U.S. 557, 573–74 (1995).

<sup>14</sup> The Board seemed to accept plaintiffs’ contention that its poster must be even-handed. *See* NLRB Br. 68–69; 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,022.

does so in a noncoercive manner,” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,022.<sup>15</sup> Yet even in cases in which the message was other than one the government had devised, a “compelled-speech violation” occurred when “the complaining speaker’s own message was affected by the speech it was forced to accommodate.” *Forum for Academic & Institutional Rights*, 547 U.S. at 63.

This brings us to what the Board considers its strongest precedent—*UAW-Labor Employment & Training Corp. v. Chao*, 325 F.3d 360 (D.C. Cir. 2003). President Bush had issued an Executive Order requiring government contractors to post notices at their workplaces informing employees of their rights not to be forced to join a union or to pay union dues for non-representational activities. Three unions and the UAW brought suit (the UAW was a government contractor). They argued that the National Labor Relations Act preempted the Executive Order. *UAW*, 325 F.3d at 362. This was their only argument. They did not raise any “free-standing First Amendment claim.” *Id.* at 364. We therefore did not reach the question whether the posting requirement violated the contractors’ freedom of speech. As to § 8(c), the unions could not plausibly claim that the Executive Order violated this provision. The National Labor Relations Board was not in the picture. That is, there was no prospect of a contractor’s being charged with an unfair labor practice for failing to post the required notice.<sup>16</sup> As we put it,

---

<sup>15</sup> Although the poster identifies the Board as its author, it does not state that the employer had no choice but to display it. We suppose an employer could post a statement next to the poster pointing out its compulsory nature. *Cf. PruneYard Shopping Ctr. v. Robins*, 447 U.S. 74, 87 (1980).

<sup>16</sup> The Board held in *Rochester Manufacturing Co.*, 323 N.L.R.B. 260, 262 (1997), that employers do not commit unfair labor practices if they fail to inform their employees of their rights not to be forced to join a union or to pay union dues for non-representational activities.

“the activities described in § 8(c) do not ‘constitute an unfair labor practice,’ except by negation, and are not ‘protected by’ the NLRA, except from the [Board] itself.” *Id.* at 365 (emphasis omitted).

We acknowledged in *UAW* that “the right to speak” includes “the right not to speak.” *Id.* And we assumed, in light of the Supreme Court’s First Amendment decisions so holding, “that the § 8(c) right includes the right not to speak.” *Id.* But the § 8(c) right was only against the Board’s finding an unfair labor practice, or evidence thereof. Beyond that, “an employer’s right to silence is sharply constrained in the labor context, and leaves it subject to a variety of burdens to post notices of rights and risks.” *Id.*

In its preamble to the posting rule, the Board interpreted these passages to mean that under § 8(c) the Board may find that employers commit unfair labor practices if they fail to disseminate the Board’s message. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,013. The Board’s interpretation of our opinion was mistaken.<sup>17</sup> In mentioning constraints on employer silence “in the labor context,” we were not referring to an employer’s protection against—as we put it—“the NLRA itself.” *UAW*, 325 F.3d at 365. We were making a different point: that apart from the § 8(c) bar against unfair-labor-practice charges, the National Labor Relations Act did not give employers an unconstrained right to silence. The Second Circuit said much the same in

---

*See UAW*, 325 F.3d at 363.

<sup>17</sup> While an agency’s interpretation of its own precedent may be entitled to deference, *see Ceridian Corp. v. NLRB*, 435 F.3d 352, 355 (D.C. Cir. 2006), we owe no deference to an agency’s interpretation of judicial precedent, *see New York New York, LLC v. NLRB*, 313 F.3d 585, 590 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

*Healthcare Ass'n*, 471 F.3d at 98–100, another preemption case.<sup>18</sup>

We return then to the question with which we began. Suppose that § 8(c) prevents the Board from charging an employer with an unfair labor practice for posting a notice advising employees of their right not to join a union. Of course § 8(c) clearly does this. How then can it be an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to post a government notice informing employees of their right to unionize (or to refuse to)? Like the freedom of speech guaranteed in the First Amendment, § 8(c) necessarily protects—as against the Board, *see UAW*, 325 F.3d at 365—the right of employers (and unions) not to speak. This is why, for example, a company official giving a noncoercive speech to employees describing the disadvantages of unionization does not commit an unfair labor practice if, in his speech, the official neglects to mention the advantages of having a union.

---

<sup>18</sup> In a footnote to its brief, the Board states that its rule satisfies *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel of the Supreme Court of Ohio*, 471 U.S. 626, 651 (1985), but it does not explain why that decision has even the slightest bearing on this case. Under *Zauderer*, the government may, consistently with the First Amendment, require a party to a commercial transaction to make disclosures in order to prevent that party from deceiving its customers. *See R.J. Reynolds*, 696 F.3d at 1215. (The Board essentially followed the same reasoning in requiring unions to inform non-union employees of their right to limit the amount of dues and fees they pay to the unions under union-shop agreements. *See Rochester Mfg. Co.*, 323 N.L.R.B. 260 (1997); *California Saw & Knife Works*, 320 N.L.R.B. 224 (1995).) But that has nothing to do with this case. As we said earlier, no one—and certainly not the Board—has even suggested that the posting rule was needed because employers are misleading employees about their rights under the National Labor Relations Act.



We therefore conclude that the Board's rule violates § 8(c) because it makes an employer's failure to post the Board's notice an unfair labor practice, and because it treats such a failure as evidence of anti-union animus in cases involving, for example, unlawfully motivated firings or refusals to hire—in other words, because it treats such a failure as evidence of an unfair labor practice.<sup>19</sup> See *Brown & Root, Inc. v. NLRB*, 333 F.3d 628, 637–39 & n.7 (5th Cir. 2003).

### III

The Board's third method of enforcing its rule is to toll the Act's limitations period for filing unfair-labor-practice charges.<sup>20</sup> That time limit, added in 1947 as part of the Taft-Hartley Act, is set forth in § 10(b) of the Act: “no complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than six months prior to the filing of the charge with the Board and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom

---

<sup>19</sup> Our conclusion here does not affect the Board's rule requiring employers to post an election notice (which similarly contains information about employee rights) before a representation election, 29 C.F.R. § 103.20. Because the failure to post the required election notice does not constitute an unfair labor practice but may be a basis for setting aside the election, *see id.* § 103.20(d), the rule does not implicate § 8(c).

<sup>20</sup> The rule provides, in relevant part:  
When an employee files an unfair labor practice charge, the Board may find it appropriate to excuse the employee from the requirement that charges be filed within six months after the occurrence of the allegedly unlawful conduct if the employer has failed to post the required employee notice unless the employee has received actual or constructive notice that the conduct complained of is unlawful.  
29 C.F.R. § 104.214(a).

such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the armed forces, in which event the six-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge.” 29 U.S.C. § 160(b).

The tolling provision differs from the two other enforcement methods we have discussed. It does not treat an employer’s failure to post the notice as an unfair labor practice, or as evidence of one. The district court nevertheless enjoined the Board from enforcing the provision. The court ruled that the provision “substantially amends the statute of limitations that Congress expressly set out in the statute” and therefore “exceeds [the Board’s] statutory authority under *Chevron* step one.”<sup>21</sup> *Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 58. We agree.

The Board characterized this portion of its rule as providing for “equitable tolling.” 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033. The Supreme Court’s decision in *Zipes v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 455 U.S. 385 (1982), the Board said, “strongly supports” its tolling rule. *Id.* We do not see it that way. *Zipes* held that the statutory time limit for charges under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(e), was a statute of limitations, not a jurisdictional requirement. *Zipes*, 455 U.S. at 393. Citing four cases from the courts of appeals, the Court analogized Title VII’s provision to § 10(b): “[T]he time requirement for filing an unfair labor practice charge under the National Labor Relations Act operates as a statute of limitations subject to recognized equitable doctrines and not as a restriction of the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, *see NLRB v. Local 264, Laborers’ Int’l Union*, 529 F.2d 778, 781–785 (CA8 1976); *Shumate v. NLRB*, 452 F.2d 717, 720 (CA4 1971); *NLRB v. A. E. Nettleton Co.*, 241 F.2d 130, 133 (CA2 1957); *NLRB v. Itasca*

---

<sup>21</sup> *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984).

*Cotton Mfg. Co.*, 179 F.2d 504, 506–507 (CA5 1950) . . .” *Id.* at 395 n.11. These four circuit court decisions held only that § 10(b) was not jurisdictional; none of the cases dealt with any equitable doctrines.

To derive support from *Zipes*, the Board must have thought that its tolling rule fell within one of the “recognized equitable doctrines.” *Id.* Yet the Board made no effort to demonstrate that when § 10(b) became law in 1947, Congress would have had any basis for assuming that the six-month limitations period might be modified by the sort of tolling rule the Board announced sixty-four years later. As we read the Supreme Court’s decisions dealing with tolling and other equitable modifications of statutes of limitations, that should have been the critical consideration. *See Gabelli v. SEC*, 133 S. Ct. 1216, 1220–24 (2013); *Credit Suisse Sec. (USA) LLC v. Simmonds*, 132 S. Ct. 1414, 1419–21 (2012); *John R. Sand & Gravel Co. v. United States*, 552 U.S. 130, 137–38 (2008); *Young v. United States*, 535 U.S. 43, 49–51 (2002); *TRW Inc. v. Andrews*, 534 U.S. 19, 27–31 (2001); *id.* at 37–39 (Scalia, J., concurring); *Rotella v. Wood*, 528 U.S. 549, 555–61 (2000); *Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson*, 501 U.S. 350, 363 (1991); *Irwin v. Dep’t of Veterans Affairs*, 498 U.S. 89, 95–96 (1990); *see also 3M Co. v. Browner*, 17 F.3d 1453, 1460–63 (D.C. Cir. 1994); Adam Bain & Ugo Colella, *Interpreting Federal Statutes of Limitations*, 37 CREIGHTON L. REV. 493 (2004); John F. Manning, *What Divides Textualists from Purposivists*, 106 COLUM. L. REV. 70, 81–82 & n.42 (2006).

We wrote in *3M*, in response to a federal agency’s argument for an “equitable” tolling exception to a statute of limitations, that we “are interpreting a statute, not creating some federal common law.” 17 F.3d at 1461. The key to interpreting a limitations statute and to determining the intent of Congress is whether the particular exception to a particular statute of

limitations was generally recognized when Congress enacted the statute. *See United States v. Kubrick*, 444 U.S. 111, 119–20 (1979). It is not enough that courts engaged in some sort of “equitable tolling” at the time Congress passed the limitations statute. “[D]ifferent types of equitable tolling . . . have been recognized at different times . . .” *Bain & Colella, supra*, 37 CREIGHTON L. REV. at 502. What matters is whether a particular basis for suspending the running of the statute of limitations had received judicial recognition when the statute became law. *See Credit Suisse Sec.*, 132 S. Ct. at 1421. After all, “Congress cannot intend to incorporate, by silence, various forms of equitable tolling that were not generally-recognized in the common law at the time of enactment.” *Bain & Colella, supra*, 37 CREIGHTON L. REV. at 503.

Thus, if a particular exception was generally recognized when Congress enacted the statute of limitations, a court may presume that Congress intended the same equitable exception to apply to the statute. If, on the other hand, the exception was not generally recognized at that time, a court could not presume that Congress intended it to suspend the running of the statutory period. *Cf. Meyer v. Holley*, 537 U.S. 280, 286 (2003) (“Congress’[s] silence, while permitting an inference that Congress intended to apply *ordinary* background tort principles, cannot show that it intended to apply an unusual modification of those rules.”).

Rather than following these legal principles, the Board relied on an analogy to the long-established equitable doctrine of fraudulent concealment.<sup>22</sup> *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033. This doctrine, which the Board has applied to toll the § 10(b)

---

<sup>22</sup> *See, e.g., Holmberg v. Armbrecht*, 327 U.S. 392 (1946); *Bailey v. Glover*, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 342 (1874).

limitations period,<sup>23</sup> has three elements: “fraudulent concealment tolls a statute of limitations when (1) there has been ‘deliberate concealment’ of (2) ‘material facts’ relating to the alleged wrongdoing and (3) the wronged party does not know of those facts and could not have discovered them through ‘reasonable diligence.’” *Int’l Ass’n of Machinists & Aerospace Workers v. NLRB*, 130 F.3d 1083, 1087 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (quoting *Fitzgerald v. Seamans*, 553 F.2d 220, 228 (D.C. Cir. 1977)); see also *Local Lodge No. 1424 v. NLRB*, 362 U.S. 411, 429 & n.19 (1960). The Board, using what it termed its “intuitive sense,” determined that even if the employee knew all the facts, in which event the fraudulent-concealment doctrine would not apply, the § 10(b) period could be suspended if the employee lacked knowledge of the law. 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033.

As Justice Scalia put it in a concurring opinion, this is “bad wine of recent vintage.” *TRW*, 534 U.S. at 37. The Board neglected to tie its theory to anything the 1947 Congress might have intended, and it contradicted the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Kubrick*, 444 U.S. 111. *Kubrick* argued that the limitations period in the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. § 2401(b)) should not begin running until he not only became aware of his injury but also learned of the law giving him a cause of action. In rejecting this argument, the Court refused to treat “a plaintiff’s ignorance of his legal rights” as if it were the same as “his ignorance of the fact of his injury,” *Kubrick*, 444 U.S. at 122, a point we relied upon in *3M*, 17 F.3d at 1461 n.14, when we rejected a similar argument.

The Board also cited a dozen or so circuit court and district court cases holding that an employer’s failure to post notices required by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and by the Age

---

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., *Don Burgess Constr. Corp.*, 227 N.L.R.B. 765 (1977), enforced, 596 F.2d 378 (9th Cir. 1979).

Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) warranted tolling. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,033–34. We take no position on whether those cases were correctly decided in light of the line of Supreme Court decisions mentioned earlier.<sup>24</sup> Whatever their validity, the two earliest cases the Board cited were decided in 1977 and 1978, more than thirty years after Congress enacted § 10(b). And in one of those—*Kephart v. Inst. of Gas Tech.*, 581 F.2d 1287, 1289 (7th Cir. 1978)—the court rested its tolling decision on the intent of Congress as reflected in a Conference Committee report.<sup>25</sup>

The short of the matter is that the Board has not invoked any authority suggesting that the 1947 Congress intended to allow § 10(b) to be modified in the manner of the Board's tolling rule. Whether one frames the Board's tolling rule as resting on the employer's failure to post the Board's notice or on the charging employee's lack of knowledge of his rights under the National Labor Relations Act, the Board marshaled nothing to show that by 1947 this was a generally accepted basis for tolling limitations periods. We have already mentioned the Supreme Court's 1979 decision in *Kubrick*, which seems to us

---

<sup>24</sup> As the district court in this case stated, there appears to be a split in the circuits on the question whether failure to post under Title VII or the ADEA warrants tolling of the limitations period. *See Nat'l Ass'n of Mfrs.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d at 57 n.20.

<sup>25</sup> *Kephart*, 581 F. 2d at 1289, and several of the other cases the Board relied upon described tolling for failure to post a notice required by statute as a "penalty." *See Posey v. Skyline Corp.*, 702 F.2d 102, 104–05 (7th Cir. 1983); *Bonham v. Dresser Indus., Inc.*, 569 F.2d 187, 193 (3d Cir. 1977). The Board concedes that its authority is remedial only and that it may not exact penalties. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,031, 54,037. The Supreme Court has so held. *See Wis. Dep't of Indus., Labor & Human Relations v. Gould, Inc.*, 475 U.S. 282, 288 n.5 (1986).

at odds with the Board's approach. It is also noteworthy that a comprehensive—and widely cited—survey of the law of statutes of limitations, published only three years after enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, contains no mention of any equitable doctrine comparable to the one reflected in the Board's rule. *See Developments in the Law: Statutes of Limitations*, 63 HARV. L. REV. 1177 (1950).<sup>26</sup> Even today courts do not generally recognize lack of knowledge of the law as a basis for equitable tolling. Some of the more recent cases from the circuits, dealing with a wide variety of statutes, are set forth in the margin.<sup>27</sup> As the Tenth Circuit stated in a case dealing with the limitations period in the Railroad Retirement Act, 45 U.S.C. § 231h, “we are aware of no authority . . . which suggests that ignorance of the law should warrant equitable tolling of a statute of

---

<sup>26</sup> Before the *Harvard Law Review* study in 1950, the only comprehensive study of statutes of limitations in America was “the fourth edition of Wood’s *Limitations* in 1916.” 63 HARV. L. REV. at 1177 (referring to H.G. WOOD, A TREATISE ON THE LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AT LAW AND IN EQUITY (Matthew Bender & Co. 4th ed. 1916)). This treatise makes clear that there was no recognized equitable doctrine permitting the tolling of a statute of limitations on the ground that the injured party did not know the law. *See* 2 WOOD, *supra*, § 276c(1), at 1408–11.

<sup>27</sup> *See, e.g., Josselyn v. Dennehy*, 475 F.3d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 2007); *Ormiston v. Nelson*, 117 F.3d 69, 72 n.5 (2d Cir. 1997); *United States v. Sosa*, 364 F.3d 507, 512 (4th Cir. 2004); *Fierro v. Cockrell*, 294 F.3d 674, 683 (5th Cir. 2002); *Graham-Humphreys v. Memphis Brooks Museum of Art, Inc.*, 209 F.3d 552, 561–62 (6th Cir. 2000); *Arrieta v. Battaglia*, 461 F.3d 861, 867 (7th Cir. 2006); *Frisby v. Milbank Mfg. Co.*, 688 F.3d 540, 544 (8th Cir. 2012) (Arkansas law); *Luna v. Holder*, 659 F.3d 753, 760 (9th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Denny*, 694 F.3d 1185, 1191 (10th Cir. 2012); *Jackson v. Astrue*, 506 F.3d 1349, 1356 (11th Cir. 2007); *United States v. Pollard*, 416 F.3d 48, 55 (D.C. Cir. 2005); *Shoshone Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation v. United States*, 672 F.3d 1021, 1032 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

limitations.” *Gatewood v. R.R. Retirement Bd.*, 88 F.3d 886, 890 (10th Cir. 1996).

We therefore hold that the Board’s tolling rule is contrary to § 10(b).

#### IV

Because all three of the means for enforcing the Board’s posting requirement are invalid, we do not decide whether, as plaintiffs also contend, the Board lacked the regulatory authority to issue subpart A of its rule—the requirement that employers post the notice specified in the appendix to that subpart. Subpart A clearly is not severable. *See MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Ass’n v. FCC*, 236 F.3d 13, 22–23 (D.C. Cir. 2001). “Severance and affirmance of a portion of an administrative regulation is improper if there is ‘substantial doubt’ that the agency would have adopted the severed portion on its own.” *Davis Cnty. Solid Waste Mgmt. v. EPA*, 108 F.3d 1454, 1459 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (per curiam) (quoting *North Carolina v. FERC*, 730 F.2d 790, 795–96 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (Scalia, J.)). If a reviewing court severed the regulation in that situation, it would be performing a function left to the agency. *See Fed. Power Comm’n v. Idaho Power Co.*, 344 U.S. 17, 20–21 (1952); *cf. Zuber v. Allen*, 402 F.2d 660, 674 (D.C. Cir. 1968).<sup>28</sup> Here we know that the Board would not have issued a posting rule that depended solely on voluntary compliance. We know this because the Board rejected that regulatory option in the preamble to its final rule. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,031. Subpart A must therefore fall along with the rest of the Board’s posting rule.

---

<sup>28</sup> Unlike in cases such as *Zuber* and *MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Ass’n*, in this case the Board did not include a severability clause in its rule and it did not include a statement on severability in its preamble to the final rule.



31

V

For the reasons stated, the Board's posting rule is vacated.

*Affirmed in part and reversed in part.*

#### ADDENDUM

##### Appendix to Subpart A—Text of Employee Notice

##### “EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) guarantees the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively with their employers, and to engage in other protected concerted activity or to refrain from engaging in any of the above activity. Employees covered by the NLRA\* are protected from certain types of employer and union misconduct. This Notice gives you general information about your rights, and about the obligations of employers and unions under the NLRA. Contact the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), the Federal agency that investigates and resolves complaints under the NLRA, using the contact information supplied below, if you have any questions about specific rights that may apply in your particular workplace.

“Under the NLRA, you have the right to:

- Organize a union to negotiate with your employer concerning your wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment.
- Form, join or assist a union.

- Bargain collectively through representatives of employees' own choosing for a contract with your employer setting your wages, benefits, hours, and other working conditions.

- Discuss your wages and benefits and other terms and conditions of employment or union organizing with your co-workers or a union.

- Take action with one or more co-workers to improve your working conditions by, among other means, raising work-related complaints directly with your employer or with a government agency, and seeking help from a union.

- Strike and picket, depending on the purpose or means of the strike or the picketing.

- Choose not to do any of these activities, including joining or remaining a member of a union.

“Under the NLRA, it is illegal for your employer to:

- Prohibit you from talking about or soliciting for a union during non-work time, such as before or after work or during break times; or from distributing union literature during non-work time, in non-work areas, such as parking lots or break rooms.

- Question you about your union support or activities in a manner that discourages you from engaging in that activity.

- Fire, demote, or transfer you, or reduce your hours or change your shift, or otherwise take adverse action against you, or threaten to take any of these actions, because you join or support a union, or because you engage in concerted activity for mutual aid and protection, or because you choose not to engage in any such activity.

- Threaten to close your workplace if workers choose a union to represent them.

- Promise or grant promotions, pay raises, or other benefits to discourage or encourage union support.

- Prohibit you from wearing union hats, buttons, t-shirts, and pins in the workplace except under special circumstances.

- Spy on or videotape peaceful union activities and gatherings or pretend to do so.

“Under the NLRA, it is illegal for a union or for the union that represents you in bargaining with your employer to:

- Threaten or coerce you in order to gain your support for the union.

- Refuse to process a grievance because you have criticized union officials or because you are not a member of the union.

- Use or maintain discriminatory standards or procedures in making job referrals from a hiring hall.

- Cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against you because of your union-related activity.

- Take adverse action against you because you have not joined or do not support the union.

“If you and your co-workers select a union to act as your collective bargaining representative, your employer and the union are required to bargain in good faith in a genuine effort to reach a written, binding agreement setting your terms and conditions of employment. The union is required to fairly represent you in bargaining and enforcing the agreement.

“Illegal conduct will not be permitted. If you believe your rights or the rights of others have been violated, you should contact the NLRB promptly to protect your rights, generally within six months of the unlawful activity. You may inquire about possible violations without your employer or anyone else being

informed of the inquiry. Charges may be filed by any person and need not be filed by the employee directly affected by the violation. The NLRB may order an employer to rehire a worker fired in violation of the law and to pay lost wages and benefits, and may order an employer or union to cease violating the law. Employees should seek assistance from the nearest regional NLRB office, which can be found on the Agency's Web site: <http://www.nlr.gov>.

You can also contact the NLRB by calling toll-free: 1-866-667-NLRB (6572) or (TTY) 1-866-315-NLRB (1-866-315-6572) for hearing impaired.

If you do not speak or understand English well, you may obtain a translation of this notice from the NLRB's Web site or by calling the toll-free numbers listed above.

“\*The National Labor Relations Act covers most private-sector employers. Excluded from coverage under the NLRA are public-sector employees, agricultural and domestic workers, independent contractors, workers employed by a parent or spouse, employees of air and rail carriers covered by the Railway Labor Act, and supervisors (although supervisors that have been discriminated against for refusing to violate the NLRA may be covered).

“This is an official Government Notice and must not be defaced by anyone.”

29 C.F.R. pt. 104, subpt. A, app.

KAREN LECRAFT HENDERSON, with whom *Circuit Judge BROWN* joins, concurring:

I fully agree with Judge Randolph's analysis of NLRA section 8(c) and wholeheartedly concur in his well-reasoned opinion. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 158(c). Judge Brown and I would also hold, however, that the Board is without authority to promulgate the posting rule under NLRA section 6 as well—the issue Judge Randolph does not reach in light of his reliance on section 8(c). Section 6 provides: “The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in the manner prescribed by subchapter II of chapter 5 of Title 5, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subchapter.” 29 U.S.C. § 156. Such “general rulemaking authority,” although facially broad, “does not mean that the specific rule the agency promulgates is a valid exercise of that authority.” *Colo. River Indian Tribes v. Nat’l Indian Gaming Comm’n*, 466 F.3d 134, 139 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Here, I do not believe the posting rule—which creates a new species of unfair labor practice unforeshadowed in the NLRA’s text—constitutes a valid exercise of the Board’s section 6 authority because the rule is not, as section 6 requires, “necessary” to carry out the express provisions of the Act.

In the Final Rule, the Board claims the posting rule is necessary to carry out sections 1 and 7 of the NLRA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 151, 157. *See* 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,007 (§ 1); *id.* at 54,032 (§ 7). Section 1 consists of four paragraphs of general findings the Congress made to justify regulating the collective bargaining process in order to eliminate and mitigate “substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce,” 29 U.S.C. § 151. Section 7 sets out the general rights “as to organization, collective bargaining, etc. . . . [that e]mployees shall have,” *id.* § 157. Neither section contains any particularized “provision” that the Board can “carry out” by regulation or otherwise.\* In

---

\*In the only other challenge to a section 6 regulation, the United States Supreme Court upheld a regulation prescribing eight (and only

the past, we have rejected such a “general declaration of policy,” by itself, as authority for a specific regulation, observing that “[a]ll questions of government are ultimately questions of ends and means.’ ” *Colo. River Indian Tribes*, 466 F.3d at 139 (quoting *Fed’n of Fed. Emps. v. Greenberg*, 983 F.2d 286, 290 (D.C. Cir. 1993)). An agency, we have stated, is “bound, not only by the ultimate purposes Congress has selected, but by the means it has deemed appropriate, and prescribed, for the pursuit of those purposes.’ ” *Id.* at 139-40 (quoting *MCI Telecomms. Corp. v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 512 U.S. 218, 231 n.4 (1994)). And the Congress, in enacting the NLRA, prescribed that the Board use *reactive* means to enforce its policies—namely, through an unfair labor practice proceeding *initiated by a charging party* or by resolving representation and election issues *when so petitioned by a party*. See 29 U.S.C. § 160 (empowering Board “as *hereinafter provided*, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice” and thereafter providing “[w]henver it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such [ULP], the Board . . . shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges”), § 159 (authorizing Board to “investigate” a petition by employees or employer regarding representation and elections “[w]henver a petition shall have been filed, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board”), § 161 (setting out Board’s

---

eight) appropriate bargaining units for acute care hospitals—a regulation that was “necessary to carry out” the Board’s obligation under one of the *substantive* provisions of the Act, namely, section 9(b) (“The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this subchapter, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof . . . .” 29 U.S.C. § 159(b)). See *Am. Hosp. Ass’n v. NLRB*, 499 U.S. 609 (1991).

“Investigatory powers . . . [f]or the purpose of all hearings and investigations, which, in the opinion of the Board, *are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by sections 159 and 160*) (emphases added); *see also Republic Steel Corp. v. NLRB*, 311 U.S. 7, 10 (1940) (NLRA “is essentially remedial” and employee’s right thereunder “is safeguarded through the authority conferred upon the Board to require the employer to desist from the unfair labor practices described and to leave the employees free to organize and choose their representatives”); *Sure-Tan, Inc. v. NLRB*, 467 U.S. 883, 900 (1984) (“Quite early on, the Court established that ‘the relief which the statute empowers the Board to grant is to be adapted to the situation which calls for redress’ ” (quoting *NLRB v. Mackay Radio & Tel. Co.*, 304 U.S. 333, 348 (1938))).

The Final Rule also claims that, as a practical matter, the posting rule is “necessary” to ensure that employees know both what their rights are under the Act and that the Board protects those rights—thereby enabling employees to exercise them under the substantive provisions of the Act. It further asserts that the Board “has reason to think that most [employees] do not” have such knowledge given “the low percentage of employees who are represented by unions, . . . ; the increasing proportion of immigrants in the work force, who are unlikely to be familiar with their workplace rights; and lack of information about labor law and labor relations on the part of high school students who are about to enter the labor force”—citing as authority three law review articles. Final Rule, 76 Fed. Reg. at 54,006 & nn.3-4; *see also* Appellees/Cross-Appellants Br. 15-16. Even assuming these speculative assertions have some factual basis and, as well, that providing such information is “necessary to carry out” the Act’s provisions, there is nothing in the text of the NLRA to suggest the burden of filling the “knowledge gap” should fall on the employer’s shoulders. Unions and the NLRB are at least as qualified to disseminate appropriate information—easily and cheaply in this information

technology age—and in fact already do so. *See, e.g.*, <http://www.nlr.gov/rights-we-protect> (NLRB’s explanation of covered employee rights, its protection of concerted activity, employer and employee reciprocal rights and obligations and its jurisdiction over private employers). The NLRA—and section 6 in particular—simply does not authorize the Board to impose on an employer a freestanding obligation to educate its employees on the fine points of labor relations law. *See Chamber of Commerce of U.S. v. NLRB*, 856 F. Supp. 2d 778, 792 n.13 (D.S.C. 2012) (“Here, the Board’s interpretation of Section 6 as authorizing the rule does not incorporate any labor-related expertise. *See Hi-Craft Clothing Co. [v. NLRB]*, 660 F.2d [910,] 918[ (3d Cir. 1981)] (“This is not a question of the Board applying a broad statutory term to a specified set of facts, but is a case of straightforward statutory construction.’”).

In sum, given the Act’s language and structure are manifestly remedial, I do not believe the Congress intended to authorize a regulation so aggressively prophylactic as the posting rule. *Accord Chamber of Commerce*, 856 F. Supp. 2d at 790-92; *see Amalgamated Transit Union v. Skinner*, 894 F.2d 1362, 1364 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (“Where Congress prescribes the form in which an agency may exercise its authority, . . . we cannot elevate the goals of an agency’s action, however reasonable, over that prescribed form.”).