

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY and UNION  
PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,

Plaintiffs

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, SEATTLE OFFICE FOR  
CIVIL RIGHTS, and JULIE NELSON, in her  
official capacity as Director, Seattle Office For  
Civil Rights,

Defendants.

No.

**COMPLAINT**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiffs BNSF Railway Company (“BNSF”) and Union Pacific Railroad Company (“Union Pacific”) (collectively “Plaintiffs”) seek a declaration, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, that the City of Seattle’s new “Paid Sick and Safe Leave” Ordinance (the “Ordinance”) is preempted, in whole or in part, by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (“RUIA”), 45 U.S.C. § 351 et seq., the Railway Labor Act (“RLA”), 45 U.S.C. § 151 et seq., the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”), 29 U.S.C. § 1140 et seq., and/or state law. Plaintiffs also seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from enforcing the Ordinance with respect to Plaintiffs’ employees.





1 13. Unionized clerical employees of BNSF and Union Pacific are not covered by a  
2 supplemental sickness plan. Instead, they receive a set number of paid sick leave days (as well  
3 as vacations, holidays, and personal leave).

4 14. During the last several rounds of collective bargaining, all of the railroad unions  
5 have proposed establishing or expanding paid sick leave benefits, in addition to the contractual  
6 and statutory benefits that railroad employees already receive. The unions have not, however,  
7 succeeded in obtaining such additional benefits at the bargaining table.

8 15. In 2011, while the most recent round of railroad collective bargaining was still  
9 ongoing, various interest groups – including some with ties to labor unions – lobbied the Seattle  
10 City Council for a new ordinance regarding paid sick leave. Some of these interest groups have  
11 publicly stated that their effort in Seattle is part of a nationwide effort to pass local and state laws  
12 requiring paid sick leave for both union and non-union workers.

13 16. On or about September 12, 2011, the Seattle City Council passed Ordinance No.  
14 123698, which requires private sector employers to provide paid sick leave and paid safe leave to  
15 their employees who perform more than 240 hours of work in Seattle within a calendar year.

16 17. The Ordinance requires that employees accrue paid time off based on “hours  
17 worked.” It permits employees to begin using such paid time off on the 180th calendar day after  
18 the commencement of employment, and allows employees to carry over unused time from year  
19 to year, subject to a maximum cap. The Ordinance exempts certain employers with “a combined  
20 or universal paid leave policy,” but only if such policy meets certain thresholds established by  
21 the Ordinance. Employees must be permitted to use leave for a set of enumerated purposes,  
22 including but not limited to the employee’s mental or physical illness, a family member’s illness,  
23 or for various reasons relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.  
24

1 18. In addition to regular pay during any period of covered leave, the Ordinance  
2 requires employers to provide “the same benefits, including health care benefits, as the employee  
3 would have earned during the time the paid leave is taken.”

4 19. The Ordinance provides that it will apply to employees covered by collective  
5 bargaining agreements unless the Ordinance requirements are “expressly waived in the collective  
6 bargaining agreement in clear and unambiguous terms.”

7 20. The Ordinance directs SOCR to promulgate regulations for implementation and  
8 enforcement of the Ordinance’s provisions.

9 21. The Ordinance goes into force on September 1, 2012.

10 22. BNSF and Union Pacific have asked SOCR to confirm that the terms of the  
11 Ordinance will not be enforced against them. SOCR has declined to do so.

12 **V. COUNT ONE**

13 23. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 22.

14 24. The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution provides that federal law  
15 is the “supreme Law of the Land” and therefore it preempts state and local laws that interfere  
16 with or are contrary to federal law.

17 25. The RUIA expressly provides that it shall be the “exclusive” source of sickness  
18 benefits or compensation for railroad employees. 45 U.S.C. § 363(b). The RUIA therefore  
19 preempts other laws that require sickness benefits or compensation for railroad employees.

20 26. Because the RUIA expressly preempts other laws that mandate sickness benefits  
21 or compensation for railroad employees, the Ordinance is preempted to the extent that it requires  
22 railroads to provide paid leave to employees for purposes of the employee’s own illness or  
23 injury.

1 **VI. COUNT TWO**

2 27. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 26.

3 28. The RLA governs labor relations in the railroad and airline industries. The  
4 purposes of the RLA include, inter alia, to “avoid any interruption to commerce or to the  
5 operation of any carrier engaged therein,” and “to provide for the prompt and orderly settlement  
6 of all disputes concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions.” 45 U.S.C. § 151a.

7 29. The RLA prohibits changes in rates of pay, rules and working conditions, as  
8 embodied in agreements, except through the collective bargaining procedures of the Act. 45  
9 U.S.C. § 152 Seventh.

10 30. In enacting the RLA, Congress intended to leave settlement of all disputes over  
11 proposed changes in rates of pay, rules, and working conditions to collective bargaining.  
12 Accordingly, state and local laws that purport to mandate changes to rates of pay, rules, and  
13 working conditions are preempted unless such laws impose only “minimum labor standards” that  
14 do not conflict with the goals of federal labor law.

15 31. The Ordinance conflicts with federal labor policy as embodied in the RLA to the  
16 extent that requires BNSF and Union Pacific to change rates of pay, rules, and working  
17 conditions in a fashion that has not been negotiated through the processes mandated by the RLA.  
18 It is therefore preempted by the RLA.

19 32. By dictating a result that alters the outcome of the railroads’ recent collective  
20 bargaining negotiations, the Ordinance deprives the plaintiff railroads of an equitable bargaining  
21 process. It is therefore preempted by the RLA.

22 33. The Ordinance is not a minimum labor standard because it imposes terms that  
23 unions have sought unsuccessfully in collective bargaining with the plaintiffs, sets standards that  
24

1 exceed state and federal law, is not of general application, and otherwise discourages and  
2 interferes with collective bargaining under the RLA. Because it does not qualify as a minimum  
3 labor standard, the Ordinance is preempted by the RLA.

4 **VII. COUNT THREE**

5 34. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 33.

6 35. Section 1144(a) of ERISA provides that it shall preempt any state or local law that  
7 “may . . . relate to any employee benefit plan . . . .”

8 36. The rail carriers’ supplemental sickness benefit plans are subject to ERISA, and  
9 qualify as “employee benefit plan[s]” within the meaning of § 1144(a) of ERISA. The  
10 Ordinance conflicts with or would alter the terms of the supplemental sickness benefit plans.

11 37. The rail carriers’ health care insurance plans are subject to ERISA, and qualify  
12 as “employee benefit plan[s]” within the meaning of § 1144(a) of ERISA. The Ordinance  
13 conflicts with or would alter the terms of the carriers’ health care insurance plans to the extent  
14 that §§ 14.16.010.O and 14.16.010.P require the provision of employee health care benefits to  
15 employees while utilizing paid leave under the Ordinance.

16 38. The provisions of the Ordinance that conflict with or otherwise “relate to” the  
17 railroads’ supplemental sickness benefit plans and/or the railroads’ health care insurance plans  
18 are preempted under § 1144(a) of ERISA.

19 **VIII. COUNT FOUR**

20 39. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 38.

21 40. Under the Washington state constitution, local ordinances or municipal  
22 regulations that prohibit what state law permits, or that otherwise conflict with state law, are  
23 preempted.  
24





1 to provide benefits to their unionized employees that were not bargained for between the parties  
2 through the procedures established by the Railway Labor Act; and

3 3. Seattle City Ordinance No. 123698 (Municipal Code Chpt. 14.16) is  
4 preempted by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act to the extent that it relates to  
5 employee benefit plans maintained by the plaintiff rail carriers; and

6 4. Seattle City Ordinance No. 123698 (Municipal Code Chpt. 14.16) is  
7 preempted by the Washington state Leave for Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and  
8 Stalking Act to the extent that it would require that safe leave be provided on a paid basis  
9 without the need for the employee to make use of other paid leave offered by the employer.

10 B. Enjoin the defendants from enforcing or otherwise applying the preempted  
11 portions of the Ordinance against the plaintiff rail carriers; and

12 C. Issue such other relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

13 DATED this 9th day of May, 2012.

14 WINTERBAUER & DIAMOND PLLC

15  
16 By: s/Kenneth J. Diamond  
17 Kenneth J. Diamond, WSBA #27009  
18 Winterbauer & Diamond PLLC  
19 1200 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1700  
20 Seattle, WA 98101  
21 Telephone: (206) 676-8446  
22 Fax: (206) 676-8441  
23 Email: mail@winterbauerdiamond.com  
24 *Local Counsel for Plaintiffs*  
BNSF Railway Company and Union Pacific  
Railroad Company

JONES DAY

By: s/Donald J. Munro

Donald J. Munro

D.C. Bar No. 453600

JONES DAY

51 Louisiana Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

Telephone: (202) 879-3922

Fax: (202) 626-1700

Email: [dmunro@jonesday.com](mailto:dmunro@jonesday.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

BNSF Railway Company and Union Pacific  
Railroad Company

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24