

22-491

United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

RESTAURANT LAW CENTER, NEW YORK STATE RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CITY OF NEW YORK, LORELEI SALAS, in her official capacity as Commissioner
of the New York City Department of Consumer and Worker Protection,
Defendants-Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of New York

**BRIEF FOR STATES OF NEW YORK, CALIFORNIA,
CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, ILLINOIS, MAINE, MARYLAND,
MASSACHUSETTS, MINNESOTA, NEW MEXICO, OREGON,
PENNSYLVANIA, RHODE ISLAND, AND WASHINGTON,
AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS AMICI CURIAE
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEES**

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD
Solicitor General
ESTER MURDUKHAYEVA
Deputy Solicitor General
STEPHEN J. YANNI
*Assistant Solicitor General
of Counsel*

LETITIA JAMES
*Attorney General
State of New York*
Attorney for Amici States
28 Liberty Street
New York, New York 10005
(212) 416-6184

(Counsel listing continues on signature pages.)

Dated: September 28, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTERESTS OF AMICI STATES.....	1
STATEMENT	3
A. The National Labor Relations Act (NLRA)	3
B. Efforts by State and Local Governments to Address Unjust Working Conditions in Fast-Food Industry	4
C. New York City’s Protections for Fast-Food Employees	7
D. “Just Cause” Laws in Other Jurisdictions	11
ARGUMENT	
POINT I	
THE NLRA DOES NOT PREEMPT THE WRONGFUL DISCHARGE LAW.....	12
A. The Wrongful Discharge Law Establishes Lawful Minimum Labor Standards.	14
B. The Wrongful Discharge Law Does Not Pressure Employers to Encourage Unionization.....	18
C. The Wrongful Discharge Law Does Not Regulate the Use of Economic Weapons.	21
POINT II	
THE WRONGFUL DISCHARGE LAW DOES NOT VIOLATE THE DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE	23
A. The Dormant Commerce Clause Does Not Displace State Sovereign Authority to Regulate In-State Economic Activity.	23

	Page
B. The Wrongful Discharge Law Does Not Discriminate Against Interstate Commerce.....	25
CONCLUSION.....	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>520 South Michigan Avenue Associates v. Shannon</i> , 549 F.3d 1119 (7th Cir. 2008).....	16-17
<i>American Ship Bldg. Co. v. NLRB</i> , 380 U.S. 300 (1965).....	21
<i>Associated Builders & Contractors of S. Cal., Inc. v. Nunn</i> , 356 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2004).....	18
<i>Association of Car Wash Owners Inc. v. City of New York</i> , 911 F.3d 74 (2d Cir. 2018)	13
<i>Building & Constr. Trades Council of the Metro. Dist. v. Associated Builders & Contractors of Mass./R.I., Inc.</i> , 507 U.S. 218 (1993).....	13
<i>Cachia v. Islamorada</i> , 542 F.3d 839 (11th Cir. 2008).....	30
<i>California Grocers Ass’n v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 52 Cal. 4th 177 (2011).....	18
<i>California v. ARC Am. Corp.</i> , 490 U.S. 93 (1989).....	12
<i>Chamber of Commerce v. Bragdon</i> , 64 F.3d 497 (9th Cir. 1995).....	16
<i>Concerned Home Care Providers, Inc. v. Cuomo</i> , 783 F.3d 77 (2d Cir. 2015)	15-17, 19
<i>CTS Corp. v. Dynamics Corp. of Am.</i> , 481 U.S. 69 (1987).....	24
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Maryland</i> , 437 U.S. 117 (1978).....	28
<i>Fort Halifax Packing Co. v. Coyne</i> , 482 U.S. 1 (1987).....	12, 15, 19

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i> , 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1 (1824).....	24
<i>Golden State Transit Corp. v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 475 U.S. 608 (1986).....	21
<i>H.P. Hood & Sons, Inc. v. Du Mond</i> , 336 U.S. 525 (1949).....	24
<i>International Franchise Ass’n v. City of Seattle</i> , 803 F.3d 389 (9th Cir. 2015).....	29-30
<i>Johnson v. Rancho Santiago Cmty. Coll. Dist.</i> , 623 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>Lodge 76, Int’l Ass’n of Machinists v. Wisconsin Emp. Rels. Comm’n</i> , 427 U.S. 132 (1976).....	13
<i>Maine v. Taylor</i> , 477 U.S. 131 (1986).....	23
<i>Matter of National Rest. Ass’n v. Commissioner of Labor</i> , 141 A.D.3d 185 (3d Dep’t 2016).....	26
<i>Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Massachusetts</i> , 471 U.S. 724 (1985).....	4, 13-15
<i>New York Pet Welfare Ass’n v. City of New York</i> , 850 F.3d 79 (2d Cir. 2017)	24-26, 28
<i>Northern Ill. Chapter of Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc. v. Lavin</i> , 431 F.3d 1004 (7th Cir. 2005).....	20
<i>Oregon Waste Sys., Inc. v. Department of Env’t Quality</i> , 511 U.S. 93 (1994).....	23
<i>Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.</i> , 397 U.S. 137 (1970).....	25

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.