

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
REGION 3

-----  
WORKERS UNITED,

Petitioner

Case No. 03-RC-282127

-and-

STARBUCKS CORPORATION,

Employer.  
-----

**OBJECTIONS**

WORKERS UNITED (herein Petitioner) hereby files the following Objections to conduct affecting the results of the above-captioned election held on December 9, 2021.

1. The employees at the Starbucks location on Camp Road, the subject of the petition in this case, were subjected to a massive campaign of overwhelming psychological force from the moment they publicly expressed the desire to form a union. The “shock and awe” campaign waged by Starbucks included, as recited below, an intense intrusion of executives and managers who attempting to create an atmosphere of fear and intimidation. The psychological harm on the employees cannot be overstated, since they had to contend with dozens of managers in a frenzy of anti-union propaganda. Every medium of attack was used, including one-on-one conversations, group meetings, constant surveillance, and a propaganda extravaganza about the dire consequences a union would bring to Starbucks. These acts of interference were in the context of similar

disruption at other stores in the community, which themselves had a secondary effect on employee morale at Camp Road. The clear aim of Starbucks was to turn these employees' world upside down until they could no longer handle the pressure anymore, leading several to give up and resign their employment. All of the Employer's conduct, as recited below, had an overwhelming cumulative effect on employees' perception of the Petitioner, above and beyond the individual effect of each discrete disruption of the laboratory conditions at the store.

2. Soon after the filing of the petition, the Employer closed several stores in the Buffalo area, either temporarily or permanently. News of this spread among workers at all Buffalo-area stores, including at the Camp Road store, and affected employees' views of the union campaign and affected their likelihood of voting for the union in the election.

3. Starting from the time the petition was filed and continuing to present, the Employer has engaged in widespread and sustained surveillance of employees at the store. This conduct included, among other things, monitoring employee organizing activity and union support within the store. Such conduct allowed the Employer to collect information about which employees should be targeted for reprisals and discriminatory conduct.

4. Starting from the time the petition was filed and continuing to present, the Employer has engaged in widespread and sustained conduct designed to give employees the impression that they were under surveillance.

5. Starting from the time the union organizing campaign was publicly announced and continuing to present, the Employer has engaged in numerous instances of soliciting employee grievances. Such solicitation was carried out by numerous Employer representatives, both in group meetings and in one-on-one meetings with prospective voters.

6. Starting from the time the petition was filed and continuing to present, the Employer has made promises of benefits that employees previously had not received, based in part on the Employer's solicitation of employee grievances.

7. Starting from the time the petition was filed and continuing to present, the Employer has implemented numerous grants of benefits that employees previously had not received, based in part on the Employer's solicitation of employee grievances.

8. Starting from the time the union organizing campaign was publicly announced and continuing to present, the Employer has threatened employees with reprisals if they voted in favor of the union in an election. Such conduct included threats that certain benefits and favorable terms and conditions of employment would be taken away if employees voted in favor of the union, among other conduct.

9. Starting from the time the union organizing campaign was publicly announced and continuing to present, the Employer has implemented reprisals in the form of numerous changes in store operations and employees' terms and conditions of employment, all of which were intended to make employees' work experience more difficult and uncomfortable. Such conduct has also negatively affected employee compensation.

10. Starting from the time the petition was filed and continuing to present, the Employer has engaged in numerous instances of discriminatory conduct towards employees it has perceived as pro union, including by reducing hours and negatively affecting employee compensation, among other things.

11. After the filing of the petition, the Employer attempted to dilute union support by temporarily closing stores and transferring employees to primarily work in the three stores with

pending NLRB petitions, including the Camp Road store, and/or encouraging employees from closed stores to work in the three petitioned-for stores.

12. Throughout the relevant time period, the Employer has maintained an overly broad no-solicitation and no-distribution policy that applies to employees. On numerous occasions, the Employer has violated this policy by having representatives solicit and/or distribute literature to employees regarding the Employer's anti-union position, during worktime and in work areas.

13. Since the time the union campaign went public and continuing through the present, the Employer has held mandatory anti-union meetings during work time. Through various communications and tactics, the Employer conveyed to employees that they could be disciplined for failing to attend such meetings.

Dated: Buffalo, New York  
December 16, 2021



---

Ian Hayes  
Creighton, Johnsen & Giroux  
Attorneys for the Petitioner  
1103 Delaware Ave.  
Buffalo, NY 14209  
716-854-0007  
ihayes@cpjglaborlaw.com