

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

Deborah S. Hunt
Clerk

100 EAST FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540
POTTER STEWART U.S. COURTHOUSE
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

Tel. (513) 564-7000
www.ca6.uscourts.gov

Filed: August 23, 2022

Mr. Arthur T. Carter
Littler Mendelson
2001 Ross Avenue
Suite 1500
Dallas, TX 75201

Ms. Laura T. Vazquez
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street, S.E.
Washington, DC 20570

Re: Case No. 22-5730, *M. McKinney v. Starbucks Corporation*
Originating Case No. : 2:22-cv-02292

Dear Counsel,

The Court issued the enclosed Order today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Michelle R. Lambert
Case Manager
Direct Dial No. 513-564-7035

cc: Mr. Thomas M. Gould

Enclosure

No. 22-5730

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED
Aug 23, 2022
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

M. KATHLEEN MCKINNEY, Regional Director)
of Region 15 of the National Labor Relations)
Board, for and on behalf of the NATIONAL)
LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,)

Petitioner-Appellee,)

v.)

STARBUCKS CORPORATION,)

Respondent-Appellant.)

ORDER

Before: GRIFFIN, NALBANDIAN, and READLER, Circuit Judges.

The Regional Director of Region 15 the National Labor Relations Board petitioned the district court for a temporary injunction pending disposition of its administrative complaint against Starbucks Corporation alleging that it engaged in unfair labor practices related to employees' union-related activities. Starbucks Corporation moves to stay the district court's partial grant of the petition, issued on August 18, 2022, under which it must: by August 23, reinstate seven terminated employees and rescind and refrain from using prior discipline decisions against one terminated employee; by August 25, post certain notices, grant all employees access to said notices, and grant Board agents access to the worksite to monitor compliance; and by September 7, comply with court-ordered directives related to the injunction. A brief stay is warranted because Starbucks "raises issues in its motion to stay pending appeal

No. 22-5730

-2-

that deserve full pleading and reasoned consideration,” and a motion to stay remains pending before the district court. *United States v. McGowan*, No. 20-1617, 2020 WL 3867418, at *1 (6th Cir. June 28, 2020) (order); *see Brady v. Nat’l Football League*, 638 F.3d 1004, 1005 (8th Cir. 2011) (“The purpose of [an] administrative stay is to give the court sufficient opportunity to consider the merits of the motion for a stay pending appeal.”).

Accordingly, an administrative stay of the district court’s order is **GRANTED** pending further order of this court following a ruling on the motion to stay below.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Deborah S. Hunt', is written over a horizontal line.

Deborah S. Hunt, Clerk