1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9		
10	FLOYD GRAYSON,	
11	Plaintiff,	Case No. 2:08-01754-KJD-GWF
12	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
13	TITANIUM METALS CORP., et al.,	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16	Presently before the Court is Defendants, United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Manufacturing,	
17	Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, CLC (the	
18	"International") and Local 4856 of the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Manufacturing, Energy,	
19	Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, CLC (the "Local"), Motion to	
20	Dismiss (#3). Though the time for doing so has passed, Plaintiff has failed to file a response in	
21	opposition to the motion. Therefore, in accordance with Local Rule 7-2(d), and good cause being	
22	found, the Court grants the motion to dismiss.	
23	I. Analysis	
24	Section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, 29 U.S.C. § 185, provides for	
25	suits in the district courts for violation of collective-bargaining agreements between labor	
26	organizations and employers without regard t	to the amount in controversy. Hines v. Anchor Motor

1 Freight, Inc., 424 U.S. 554, 562 (1976). Section 301 contemplates suits by individual employees as 2 well as between unions and employers. See id. Section 301 encompasses suits seeking "to vindicate 3 uniquely personal rights of employees such as wages, hours, overtime pay, and wrongful discharge." 4 Id. Plaintiff's present suit against Titanium Metals Corporation and the International and Local 5 Unions for breach of contract, breach of the duty of fair representation, retaliation, conspiracy, and 6 interference with prospective economic advantage is the kind of case Congress provided for in 7 Section 301. See id. Therefore, though some claims appear to be framed under state law, they are 8 clearly preempted. See Stallcop v. Kaiser Found. Hosp., 820 F.2d 1044, 1048 (9th Cir. 1987).

9 Grayson's claim for breach of contract is a hybrid section 301 and fair representation claim. 10 See Harris v. Alumax Mill Products, Inc., 897 F.2d 400, 404 (9th Cir. 1990). A fair representation 11 claim is an assertion that the Union breached its duty to fairly and responsibly represent plaintiff. 12 Without the hybrid claim, an employer could always escape liability for wrongful discharge by 13 asserting a plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies set up by a collective bargaining 14 agreement. See Hines, 424 U.S. at 562-67. The Supreme Court has held that the six-month statute 15 of limitations period contained in section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act applies to hybrid 16 suits. See DelCostello v. Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters, 462 U.S. 151 (1983).

17 Grayson's claim accrued no later than August 5, 2005 when he was informed by the Union 18 Defendants that his claim was not suitable for arbitration. See Harris, 897 F.2d at 404 (citing 19 Galindo v. Stoody Co., 793 F.2d 1502, 1509 (9th Cir. 1986) (the statute of limitations "begins to run 20 when an employee knows or should have known of the alleged breach of duty of fair 21 representation"). Grayson, however, did not file his complaint until December 12, 2008, at least 22 fourty (40) months later. Grayson asserted these facts in his complaint and the Court must take them 23 as true in resolving a motion to dismiss, especially where Plaintiff has made no response disputing 24 this. Thus, his complaint against the Unions is time-barred. 25 ////

26 ////

1 II. Conclusion

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants, United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, CLC (the "International") and Local 4856 of the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, CLC (the "Local"), Motion to Dismiss (#3) is **GRANTED**. DATED this 30th day of January 2009. Kent J. Dawson United States District Judge