

## NLRB Settles Facebook Discharge Case

### Little Guidance Provided; Employers Advised to Exercise Caution

By Bennett Pine

In our December 2010 *Employment Law Insider Alert*, we highlighted the prosecution by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) of a Connecticut ambulance service that had terminated an employee for posting negative comments about her supervisor and employer on Facebook from her home computer. NLRB prosecuted on the basis that the employee's Facebook posting and subsequent postings by co-workers constituted "protected concerted activity."

On February 7, 2011, on the eve of a hearing on the case, the NLRB announced that a settlement had been reached.

#### Case Background

According to the NLRB, its Hartford regional office issued a complaint against American Medical Response (AMR) of Connecticut on October 27, 2010, alleging that the discharge violated federal labor law because the employee was engaged in protected activity when she posted the comments about her supervisor, and responded to further comments from her co-workers. Under the National Labor Relations Act, employees may freely discuss the "terms and conditions" of their employment with co-workers and others, during non-working time.

The NLRB complaint also alleged that the company maintained overly broad rules in its employee handbook regarding blogging, Internet posting and communications between employees, and that it had illegally denied union representation to the employee during an investigatory interview shortly before the employee posted the negative comments on her Facebook page.

"The NLRB complaint also alleged that the company maintained overly broad rules in its employee handbook regarding blogging. ..."

ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
(212) 278-1000 Fax: (212) 278-1733

ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.  
One Gateway Center, Suite 1510  
Newark, NJ 07102  
(973) 642-5858 Fax: (973) 621-6361

ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.  
1600 Market Street, Suite 2500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(267) 216-2700 Fax: (215) 568-4573

ANDERSON KILL WOOD & BENDER, P.C.  
864 East Santa Clara Street  
Ventura, CA 93001  
(805) 288-1300 Fax: (805) 288-1301

ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, L.L.P.  
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 416-6500 Fax: (202) 416-6555

ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.  
1055 Washington Boulevard, Suite 510  
Stamford, CT 06901  
(203) 388-7950 Fax: (203) 388-0750

[www.andersonkill.com](http://www.andersonkill.com)



## who's who

**Bennett Pine** is a shareholder in Anderson Kill's New York and

Newark offices and is chair of the firm's employment & labor group. Mr. Pine has broad-based labor and employment law experience and regularly plays a hands-on role offering preventative maintenance advice and counseling to employers in the full range of legal issues affecting the workplace.

**NY: (212) 278-1288**

**Newark: (973) 642-5006**

**bpine@andersonkill.com**

The information appearing in this newsletter does not constitute legal advice or opinion. Such advice and opinion are provided by the firm only upon engagement with respect to specific factual situations.



**Be carbon  
conscious ...  
Please  
consider  
switching your  
subscription to email.**

By switching to email, you will receive our timely **Client Alerts** that are sent by email only. It's easy, send your mailing and email address to [andersonkill@andersonkill.com](mailto:andersonkill@andersonkill.com).

*To subscribe to Anderson Kill Newsletters and Alerts, please visit [www.andersonkill.com/publications\\_subscribe.asp](http://www.andersonkill.com/publications_subscribe.asp). To unsubscribe, please email [unsubscribe@andersonkill.com](mailto:unsubscribe@andersonkill.com).*

© Copyright 2011 Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C.

## The Settlement

In the settlement by NLRB Hartford Regional Director Jonathan Kreisberg, AMR agreed to revise its overly broad rules to ensure that they do not improperly restrict employees from discussing their wages, hours and working conditions with co-workers and others while not at work, and that they would not discipline or discharge employees for engaging in such discussions.

The company also promised that employee requests for union representation will not be denied in the future and that employees will not be threatened with discipline for requesting union representation. The allegations involving the employee's discharge were resolved through a separate, private agreement between the employee and the company.

## Caution for Employers

Unfortunately, the settlement of the AMR case meant that the board did not, as expected by many employers and commentators, take the opportunity to establish "bright light" rules clearly articulating the application of the NLRB's 75-year-old "concerted activity" protections in the context of contemporary Internet and social media communications by employees.

However, synthesizing the NLRB's complaint and the resulting settlement, the message seems clear that the NLRB intends to protect employees' rights to discuss their wages, hours and working conditions with co-workers and others while they are off-duty, and that the protections will apply whether such communications take place at the water cooler, on a bulletin board or on a social media venue such as Facebook.

Significantly, these employee protections apply whether or not the employer's workforce is unionized. Employers violate the NLRB if they discharge or otherwise punish workers because of statements or criticisms they make on social media that the board views as protected, concerted activity.

As a result of the lack of clear guidance from the NLRB, employers need to exercise care to be sure that their email, Internet, social media and related policies do not impermissibly interfere with employees' rights to discuss their wages, hours and working conditions or otherwise to engage in concerted activities while not "at work." As previously indicated, it may be prudent for employers to include protective disclaimer language in any Internet or social media policy to the effect that the policy is not to be applied or interpreted in any manner that interferes with employee rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

## Conclusion

Until clear standards defining precisely what Internet, website or email communications constitute protected, concerted activity, employers are urged to exercise caution before imposing discipline or discharge as the result of such employee communications. ▲

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.