

BENDER'S CALIFORNIA LABOR & EMPLOYMENT BULLETIN

Vol. 2014, No. 5 • May 2014
Michael C. Sullivan, Editor-in-Chief



Inside This Issue	
California Supreme Court to Clarify Suitable Seating Requirements	
AARON BUCKLEY	161
Verdicts & Settlements	
DEBORAH J. TIBBETTS	167
Dead on Arrival: E-Discovery and Class Action Disputes	
DANIEL B. GARRIE & TARIQUE N. COLLINS	172
There's an App for That – Banning “Smoking Gun” Audio Recordings from the Workplace	
APRIL N. LOVE	176
CASE NOTES	
<i>Arbitration</i>	179
<i>Class Action Fairness Act</i>	180
<i>Diversity Jurisdiction</i>	181
<i>Federal Preemption</i>	182
<i>Limitations Period</i>	183
<i>Overtime Compensation</i>	184
<i>Protected Activity</i>	185
<i>Public Employees</i>	186
<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	187
<i>State Unemployment Benefits</i>	188
<i>Whistleblower Protection</i>	189
<i>Workers' Compensation Insurance</i>	190
CALENDAR OF EVENTS	
EDITORIAL BOARD AND AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION	
	193

California Supreme Court to Clarify Suitable Seating Requirements

By Aaron Buckley

Introduction

On March 12, 2014, the California Supreme Court granted a request by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to clarify how the state law requiring employers to provide workers with “suitable seating” should be applied. The court’s decision could affect most California employers, and could have a dramatic impact on large retailers, virtually all of which have been targeted by suitable seating litigation in the last decade.

California’s “Suitable Seating” Requirements

California’s Industrial Wage Commission (“IWC”) wage orders require most employers to provide “suitable seats” to their employees “when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats.”¹ This requirement has existed for decades, but was little noticed until after the enactment of the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”).² PAGA allows employees to sue their employers on behalf of themselves and other “aggrieved employees” for violation of Labor Code provisions and allows prevailing plaintiffs to collect civil penalties that were previously available only in administrative enforcement actions brought by the state’s Labor and Workforce Development Agency.³

Although the suitable seating requirement does not appear within the Labor Code itself, section 1198 of the Labor Code makes it unlawful to employ any

¹ See, e.g., IWC Wage Order 4-2001 § 14(A); IWC Wage Order 7-2001 § 14(A).

² CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 2698-2699.5.

³ CAL. LAB. CODE § 2699(A).

(Continued on page 163)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Michael C. Sullivan, Editor-in-Chief
Matthew Jedreski, Executive Editor
Deborah J. Tibbetts, Associate Editor
 Paul, Plevin, Sullivan & Connaughton LLP
 San Diego

Ray Bertrand
 Paul Hastings LLP
 San Diego

Aaron A. Buckley
 Paul Plevin Sullivan & Connaughton, LLP
 San Diego

Nicole A. Diller
 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
 San Francisco

Barbara A. Fitzgerald
 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
 Los Angeles

Joshua Henderson
 Seyfarth Shaw LLP
 San Francisco

Lynne C. Hermle
 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
 Menlo Park

Alan Levins
 Littler Mendelson, P.C.
 San Francisco

Tyler M. Paetkau
 Hartnett, Smith & Paetkau
 Redwood City

William B. Sailer
 QUALCOMM Incorporated
 San Diego

Charles D. Sakai
 Renne, Sloan, Holtzman & Sakai
 San Francisco

Arthur F. Silbergeld
 Norton Rose Fulbright LLP
 Los Angeles

Walter Stella
 Miller Law Group
 San Francisco

Peder J. Thoreen
 Altshuler Berzon LLP
 San Francisco

Bill Whelan
 Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith, LLP
 San Diego

M. Kirby Wilcox
 Paul Hastings LLP
 San Francisco

REPORTERS

Michael J. Etchepare
 Paul, Plevin, Sullivan & Connaughton LLP
 San Diego

April Love
 Littler Mendelson, P.C.
 Houston

Brit K. Seifert
 Paul Hastings LLP
 San Diego

COLUMNISTS

Brian M. Ragen
 Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP
 Los Angeles

Phyllis W. Cheng
 Director, Dept. of Fair Employment and Housing

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is provided with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional service. If legal or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

From the Declaration of Principles jointly adopted by a Committee of the American Bar Association and a Committee of Publishers and Associations.

A NOTE ON CITATION: The correct citation form for this publication is: 2014 Bender's Calif. Lab. & Empl. Bull. 161 (May 2014).

EBOOK ISBN 978-0-3271-6747-1

Dead on Arrival: E-Discovery and Class Action Disputes

By Daniel B. Garrie & Tarique N. Collins

Introduction

Class actions are often among the most explosive, costly, and challenging lawsuits faced by lawyers, courts and litigants. This is certainly true when it comes to discovery and e-discovery issues. Managing e-discovery is a challenge when only two parties are involved. Confronted with a class or multiple classes of plaintiffs or defendants – ranging in numbers from tens to tens of thousands - constructing a cogent and competent discovery strategy becomes a significant challenge. When faced with such cases, courts and party attorneys should consider appointing a Special Master, a court sanctioned referee of sorts, to power through discovery and e-discovery issues. A Special Master can assist in reducing the discovery burdens on all parties by working to lower costs, assisting with cost allocation, and aiding the court to police and address discovery abuses. The parties can, therefore, focus on the legal and factual issues actually driving a case, rather than become sidetracked by discovery disputes.

Advantages to Appointing a Special Master

A Special Master is able to work with both parties by offering creative solutions to problems that arise. The court's power to appoint a Special Master stems from Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. And with the sheer breadth of Rule 53, Special Masters may be appointed for any number of reasons.¹ In fact, Special Masters typically assist with facilitating the electronic discovery process, monitoring discovery compliance, adjudicating legal disputes, and adjudicating technical disputes and compliance.² To be sure,

¹ Specifically, Rule 53 allows a court to appoint a Special Master to 1) perform duties consented to by the parties; 2) hold trial proceedings and make or recommend findings of fact on issues to be decided by the court without a jury if appointment is warranted by either i) some exceptional condition, or ii) the need to perform an accounting or resolve a difficult computation of damages; or 3) address pretrial and post trial matters that cannot be addressed effectively and timely by an available district judge or magistrate judge of the district. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 53(a)(1).

² Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin & Jonathan M. Redgrave, *Special Masters and E-Discovery: The Intersection of Two Recent Revisions To The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*, 30 CARDOZO L. REV. 347 (2008).

the appointment of a Special Master alleviates the burdens of electronic discovery in very specific ways.

Expert Oversight

A Special Master provides expert oversight that ensures that fewer mistakes are made in discovery, and that any mistakes that do occur are identified and resolved earlier in the process. In any litigation, but especially in class actions requiring nationwide searches of hundreds of custodial sites, attorneys confront the very real and risky scenario that the client(s) might forget to disclose a particularly critical data source, or that a critical data source, though disclosed, may slip through the necessarily diffuse production process. At its worst, such an event may be instrumental in costing the attorney the case itself.³ Even in a best-case scenario, however, such an event will reduce the personal credibility the attorney has painstakingly developed with the court and client. Accordingly, both parties should ensure that they have taken all appropriate and reasonable steps in discovery as the consequences of failing to do so can be quite painful. By agreeing to the appointment of a Special Master to oversee the discovery process in a neutral manner, litigants demonstrate that they are committed to participating in discovery in good faith.

Facilitation of Agreement & Compromise

A Special Master facilitates agreement and compromise between parties to mutual advantage. Because the stakes are so high in class-action litigation, most issues, no matter how minute, are typically bitterly contested. And there are often expensive world-class experts on both sides who issue opinions over the smallest details. Yet compromise is possible because the facts regarding e-discovery issues are often verifiable, that is, binary 1s and 0s simply do not lie. Either the data was deleted or it was not; either the court allowed the parties to encrypt the data or it did not; either a search costs a certain amount or it does not; either a search term exists in the dataset or it does not.

³ *See, e.g.,* Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC, 220 F.R.D. 212, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18771 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (defendant sanctioned and ordered to pay discovery costs following a court finding of discovery abuses).

Indeed, electronic discovery is largely a binary logic operation that is not subject to the factual vagaries of disputed wind speeds, weight levels, or pre-existing conditions. So in this respect, the Special Master can expeditiously resolve many issues so that time and money can be spent litigating the substance of the case. A simple fact is that without Special Masters, parties end up wasting vast amounts of resources. Put plainly, the discovery process need not be as burdensome as it has become. As discovery must be cooperative to succeed, the neutral Special Master helps to ensure that an adversarial posture (more suitable for the trial stage) benefits neither party in discovery. The Special Master thus provides parties an important opportunity to resolve disputes without either party compromising its litigation strategy.

Creation of a Logical Discovery Plan

A Special Master assists with the creation of a logical discovery plan, such as the scope of preservation. In class actions, custodians often number in the thousands with hundreds of thousands of computers, smart phones, and other devices in play. Under these circumstances, the Special Master can assist the parties, from the outset, to identify custodians and the likely sources of relevant electronically stored information, as well as the steps and costs required to access such information. Failing to employ these crucial measures is the legal equivalent of *seppuku* (ritual suicide). Not only will data likely be lost or deleted before it is eventually identified as relevant, but the parties may spend months litigating an issue for which they do not fully understand the universe of relevant information. Working alongside the parties, the Special Master is better able to grasp the universe of information within the parties' possession to develop preservation plans and litigation holds so that key documents do not go missing. Here, costly battles over destroyed evidence that routinely distract from the substantive case are avoided. By having a Special Master involved throughout the discovery process, parties will not only save time and money, but will also better achieve their objectives.

Recent Cases

In re Pradaxa Products Liability Litigation

Recent decisions in certain large class action cases point to the dire need for Special Masters' expertise in streamlining the complexities of electronic discovery. For instance, in *In re Pradaxa (Dabigatran Etexilate) Products Liability Litigation*, a class action

product liability case, a Seventh Circuit District Court imposed financial sanctions against a pharmaceutical company for, among other things, the failure to preserve certain records and implement adequate litigation holds.⁴ The plaintiffs presented the court with a detailed list of the defendants' ongoing discovery violations, which included the failure to issue adequate litigation holds for certain employees, and the failure to produce relevant documents - in violation of the case management order.⁵ The court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, characterizing the defendants' litigation hold as "grossly inadequate for a litigation of [such] scope and size."⁶

As the court explained, the defendants' "bad faith" prejudiced the plaintiffs as it resulted in "countless hours of chambers time and courtroom time discussing and advocating issues that did not need to occur."⁷ As a result, the court imposed financial sanctions as a means to curb the defendants' repeated violations.⁸ In *Pradaxa*, the appointment of a Special Master at the outset of the litigation could have facilitated cooperation among the parties. Specifically, a Special Master could have determined the proper scope of preservation, thereby reducing the burden on both plaintiffs and defendants while keeping the court informed of any discovery abuses. Although at various points, both parties requested, and the court granted, the appointment of a Special Master to address certain discrete issues, the Special Master should have been authorized to work consistently with the parties from the start to avoid unnecessary disputes. By contrast, it was months into discovery before the plaintiffs requested the appointment of a Special Master to attend all corporate depositions, citing "improper instructions not to answer questions and the recent loss of two months of deposition time as a result of the defendants' document production problems."⁹ Similarly, the defendants later requested a Special Master to "mediate discovery disputes."¹⁰

⁴ MDL No. 2385, 3:12-md-02385-DRH-SCW, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *46 (S.D. Ill. Dec. 9, 2013).

⁵ 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *46.

⁶ 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *46.

⁷ 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *69-70.

⁸ 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *69-70.

⁹ 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *69-70 (Case Management Order 41, Appointment of Special Master).

¹⁰ 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173674, at *69-70 (Case Management Order 43, Discovery Special Master).

Pradaxa presents very starkly the costs of not fully utilizing a Special Master, who, unlike most litigants, is able to approach discovery in a fair and common-sense manner eliminating both duplicative discovery and fishing expeditions, thereby saving the parties (and the court) time and money through increased efficiency and cooperation.

Romero v. Allstate Insurance Company

Similarly, *Romero v. Allstate Insurance Company*, a Third Circuit District Court case, illustrates the advantage of appointing Special Masters to facilitate the electronic discovery process while addressing the parties' privacy concerns.¹¹ *Romero*, an employment class action, involved certain Allstate Insurance Companies' (collectively, "Allstate") alleged attempt to transmute employees' status to independent contractor status, depriving them of their employee benefits.¹² The plaintiffs' filed a motion to compel which would have required Allstate to confer with the class action plaintiffs over electronic search terms.¹³ Plaintiffs' motion sought to force the parties to cooperate in order to avoid an "e-discovery trial."¹⁴ Allstate, however, was not keen on disclosing to the class action plaintiffs keyword search terms used by Allstate in prior matters, or how those prior searches were performed, and so refused to confer.¹⁵ Allstate opposed the motion, contending its keyword search history constituted privileged attorney work-product and, therefore, was protected from disclosure.¹⁶ Allstate's argument fell on deaf judicial ear, and the *Romero* Court ruled in large part against Allstate.¹⁷

The *Romero* Court found that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, specifically Rule 26(f)'s meet and confer obligations, required Allstate to participate in the requested meet and confer, and share the information sought.¹⁸ In this regard, the court determined that while Rule 26(f) does not necessarily require the

parties to adopt the most cost-effective or logical plan, it does require the parties to discuss "any issues about disclosure or discovery of [electronically stored information], including the form or forms in which it should be produced."¹⁹ The *Romero* Court held that the broad scope of Rule 26(f) made it reasonable to require Allstate to meet and confer on search terms, date ranges, and methodology.²⁰ Thus, in a class action, as with other federal actions, Rule 26(f) requires that the parties meet and confer to develop a discovery plan. As a result, if the parties cannot or will not "play nice" in the electronic discovery "sandbox" they will suffer the consequences.

In a situation like that faced by the *Romero* parties, a Special Master appointed to oversee the document production may well have enabled the class action plaintiffs to avoid the need for the motion to compel, while simultaneously allowing Allstate to protect its confidential information and avoid the court's scorn. Specifically, the addition of a Special Master to help the parties develop a joint discovery plan would have allowed Allstate to provide its confidential information *in camera* to the Special Master. The Special Master could then incorporate the information in the joint plan, giving the class action plaintiffs what they needed while helping Allstate avoid embarrassment and wasted time.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes

Finally, in the wake of *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, a sex discrimination case involving a challenge to Wal-Mart's pay and promotion practices, class certification now poses new challenges to plaintiffs – challenges which can be ameliorated by using a Special Master.²¹ In its decision, the United States Supreme Court called for a "rigorous analysis" to ensure that class certification is consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a).²² This rigorous analysis requires a far more efficient discovery process - one in which a Special Master would be of tremendous value. To prevail, plaintiffs must now demonstrate via additional discovery that they meet each requirement of Rule 23. Here, a Special Master is uniquely positioned to reduce the plaintiffs' discovery burdens while being fair and balanced to both parties.

¹¹ 271 F.R.D. 96, 106, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111985 (E.D. Pa. 2010).

¹² 271 F.R.D. at 99.

¹³ 271 F.R.D. at 109-10.

¹⁴ 271 F.R.D. at 100.

¹⁵ 271 F.R.D. at 109.

¹⁶ 271 F.R.D. at 109.

¹⁷ 271 F.R.D. at 111.

¹⁸ 271 F.R.D. at 109-10.

¹⁹ FED. R. CIV. P. 26(f)(3)(C).

²⁰ *Romero*, 271 F.R.D. at 109-10.

²¹ 131 S. Ct. 2541 (2011).

²² 131 S. Ct. at 2551.

Conclusion

In complex matters, including class actions, the court or the parties should strongly consider placing the oversight and control of the litigation in the hands of a Special Master. A Special Master, having the required technical and legal expertise and experience, can look at the 1s, the 0s and the legal arguments in order to separate fact from fiction in a more expedient manner, without the need for costly hearings, additional experts, and other expenses. Overall, as a neutral party, a Special Master has more credibility to employ cost-effective

and efficient strategies to reduce the discovery burdens of both the court and the litigants.

Daniel B. Garrie is a Partner at LawandForensics.com, where he focuses on e-discovery, computer security, and forensics. Mr. Garrie is also Special Counsel to the law firm of Zeichner Ellman & Krause LLP (www.zeklaw.com), specializing in e-discovery and cyber-security matters. Tarique N. Collins is an associate in the New York Office of Zeichner Ellman & Krause LLP, where he specializes in commercial litigation. The views expressed herein are their own.

EDITORIAL BOARD**Contact Information**

Michael C. Sullivan, Editor-in-Chief
Matthew Jedreski, Executive Editor
Deborah J. Tibbetts, Associate Editor
Paul, Plevin, Sullivan & Connaughton LLP
San Diego
msullivan@paulplevin.com
mjedreski@paulplevin.com
dtibbetts@paulplevin.com

Ray Bertrand
Paul Hastings LLP
San Diego
raymondbertrand@paulhastings.com

Aaron A. Buckley
Paul Plevin Sullivan & Connaughton, LLP
San Diego
abuckley@paulplevin.com

Nicole A. Diller
(ERISA/Employee Benefits)
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
San Francisco
ndiller@morganlewis.com

Barbara A. Fitzgerald
(Entertainment)
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Los Angeles
bfitzgerald@morganlewis.com

Joshua Henderson
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
San Francisco, CA 94105
jhenderson@seyfarth.com

Lynne C. Hermle
(Retaliation/Whistleblowers)
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
Menlo Park
lchermle@orrick.com

Alan Levins
Littler Mendelson P.C.
San Francisco
alevins@littler.com

Tyler Paetkau
(Unfair Competition/Trade Secrets)
Hartnett, Smith & Paetkau
Redwood City
tpaetkau@hslawoffice.com

William B. Sailer
(In-House)
V.P. & Senior Legal Counsel
QUALCOMM Inc.
San Diego
wsailer@qualcomm.com

Charles D. Sakai
(Public Sector)
Renne, Sloan, Holtzman & Sakai
San Francisco
csakai@rshslaw.com

Arthur F. Silbergeld
(Class Actions)
Norton Rose Fulbright LLP
Los Angeles
arthur.silbergeld@nortonrosefulbright.com

Walter Stella
Miller Law Group
San Francisco
wms@millerlawgroup.com

Peder J. Thoreen
(Labor)
Altshuler Berzon LLP
San Francisco
pthoreen@altshulerberzon.com

Bill Whelan
(Wrongful termination)
Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith, LLP
San Diego
wwhelan@swsslw.com

M. Kirby Wilcox
(Wage and Hour)
Paul Hastings LLP
San Francisco
kirbywilcox@paulhastings.com

COLUMNISTS
Contact Information

Eye on the Supreme Court

Brian M. Ragen
Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP
Los Angeles
byr@msk.com

Verdicts and Settlements

Deborah J. Tibbetts
Paul, Plevin, Sullivan &
Connaughton LLP
San Diego

DFEH Update

Phyllis W. Cheng
Director, Dep't of Fair
Employment & Housing

REPORTERS
Contact Information

Michael J. Etchepare
(Public Sector)
Paul, Plevin, Sullivan & Connaughton LLP
San Diego
metchepare@paulplevin.com

Brit K. Seifert
(Wage and Hour)
Paul Hastings LLP
San Diego
britseifert@paulhastings.com

April Love
(Labor)
Littler Mendelson, P.C.
Houston
alove@littler.com

EDITORIAL STAFF

Eve Arnold
Director, Content Development

Mia Smith
Legal Editor

Howard Ross
Editor

GUEST AUTHORS

Tarique N. Collins
Zeichner Ellman & Krause LLP
New York, NY
tcollins@zeklaw.com

Daniel B. Garrie
Law & Forensics LLC
New York, NY
daniel@lawandforensics.com

Customer Service: **1.800.356.6548**

For all your labor and employment research needs,
see the Labor & Employment Area of Law Page at
Legal > Area of Law - By Topic > Labor & Employment on *lexis.com*[®]

LexisNexis[®] Total Research System

My Lexis™ Search Research Tasks Get a Document Shepard's® Alerts Total Litigator Transactional Advisor Counsel S

by Source | by Topic or Headnote | by Guided Search Form | by Dot Command

[Look for a Source](#) [Online Store](#)

Option 2 - Look for a Source

Add/Edit Tabs Use checkboxes to select sources for searching across categories, pages, and tabs. [Show Me...](#) [Combine Sources](#)

Legal News & Business Public Records Labor & Employment Find A Source

(Remove "Labor & Employment" tab)

[Research Americans with Disabilities Act](#)

[Find Cases](#)

Federal & State Cases, Combined [i](#)

Labor & Employment Cases, Federal and State [i](#)

Labor Cases and Administrative Materials, Federal [i](#)

Public Employee Reporters - Selected States [i](#)

[Federal](#) [State](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Find Statutes & Regulations](#)

United States Code Service - Titles 1 through 50 [i](#)

USCS - Labor - Titles 5, 8, 26, 29, 30, 38, 39 and 42 [i](#)

CFR and Federal Register - Labor Titles [i](#)

State Codes, Constitutions, Court Rules & ALS, Combined [i](#)

Municipal Codes [i](#)

[Federal](#) [State](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Find Administrative Materials](#)

National Labor Relations Board Decisions & General Counsel Memos [i](#)

Labor Agency Decisions, Combined [i](#)

Dept. of Labor Opinion Letters, FMLA and Wages & Hours Combined [i](#)

Merit Systems Protection Board Decisions - Board and AJ Decisions Combined [i](#)

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Public Sector Decisions [i](#)

[Federal](#) [State](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Search Forms & Drafting Instructions](#)

Federal Labor & Employment LexisNexis Forms [i](#)

Current Legal Forms for Labor and Employment [i](#)

BNA Employment Law Client Letters, Checklists, and Forms [i](#)

Employment Litigation Defense Forms [i](#)

ABA Model Jury Instructions Employment Litigation [i](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Find Briefs, Motions, Pleadings & Verdicts](#)

Federal and State Labor & Employment Briefs and Motions, Combined [i](#)

Federal and State Labor & Employment Pleadings, Combined [i](#)

Jury Verdicts and Settlements, Combined [i](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Investigate Properties, People & Business](#)

[Total Litigator](#)

[Search Analysis, Law Reviews & Journals](#)

Labor & Employment Emerging Issues [i](#)

Labor and Employment Law [i](#)

Larson on Employment Discrimination [i](#)

National Labor Relations Act: Law and Practice [i](#)

BNA Labor & Employment Law Library (Group File) [i](#)

Employee Rights Litigation: Pleading and Practice [i](#)

Unjust Dismissal [i](#)

[By State](#) [By Publisher](#)

[By Subtopic](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Health Care Reform Resources](#)

[Emerging Issues](#)

Labor & Employment Emerging Issues [i](#)

All Emerging Issues, Combined by Area of Law [i](#)

Kopp, Paley, Bacon and Foster on Health Care Reform Legislation [i](#)

[Discrimination](#) [FMLA](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Find Arbitration Materials](#)

AAA Labor Arbitration Awards [i](#)

AAA Employment Arbitration Awards [i](#)

BNA Labor Relations Reporter Labor Arbitration Reports [i](#)

Labor & Employment Arbitration [i](#)

O'Meara, Employment Arbitration [i](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Search News](#)

Bender's Labor & Employment Bulletin [i](#)

Employment Law: Mealey's Litigation Report [i](#)

BNA Daily Labor Report [i](#)

Mega News, Gender & Sex Discrimination in Employment [i](#)

Mega News, Sexual Harassment [i](#)

Age Discrimination: Mealey's [i](#)

Mega News, Most Recent Two Years (English, Full Text) [i](#)

[View more sources](#)

[Access Directories](#)

Martindale-Hubbell(R) Law Directory - Labor and Employment Law Listings [i](#)

[View more sources](#)