

STATE OF MAINE

BUSINESS AND CONSUMER COURT

Cumberland, ss.

CLAIMANTS REPRESENTED BY COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 1400 and INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL 2327,

Petitioners,

v.

Docket Nos. BCD-AP-17-07 ✓

MAINE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION,

Respondent,

**FAIRPOINT LOGISTICS, INC. and NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE OPERATIONS LLC
(d/b/a FAIRPOINT COMMUNICATION-NSE),**

Parties-in-Interest.

DECISION ON APPEAL AFTER REMAND

This case presents an appeal from a decision of the Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission [“the Commission”] denying unemployment compensation benefits to the Petitioners.¹ The 255 Petitioners are former or current employees of Parties-in-Interest FairPoint Logistics, Inc. and Northern New England Telephone Operations LLC, d/b/a FairPoint Communications-NSE [collectively “FairPoint”]

¹ The employees whose claims for unemployment compensation are at issue in this appeal are listed in the attachments to this Decision, which consist of pages 023-041 and 1699-1700 of the Record on Appeal.

who were involved in a labor dispute during late 2014 and early 2015. *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1794-1850.²

Oral argument on the appeal was held June 4, 2018.

Based on the entire record, the court denies the appeal and affirms the Commission decision.

The Initial Commission Decision and Initial Appeal

The decision under appeal is the Commission's second decision on the Petitioners' claims. The initial decision denying Petitioners' claims was appealed to this court, which vacated the decision and remanded the claims to the Commission for further proceedings consistent with the court's ruling. *See* Decision on Appeal, *Claimants Represented By Communications Workers Of America, Local 1400 And International Brotherhood Of Electrical Workers, Local 2327 v. Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission*, Me. Bus. & Cons. Ct. Docket Nos. BCD-AP-15-06 and -16-01 (Aug. 26, 2016), R. 2003-26. *See also* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 15-C-03849 (Oct. 1, 2015), R. 2-22.

The initial proceedings before the Commission and appeal to this court are hereinafter referred to as "Claimants I."

² This and similar citations herein are to the eight-volume Record on Appeal. The first six volumes of the Record on Appeal, R. 1-1793, consist of the same materials that were in the record on appeal in the initial appeal to this court. Volumes seven and eight, R. 1794-2448, consist of material that came into the record during the Commission proceedings after the court's remand.

This court's Decision on Appeal in Claimants I focused almost exclusively on legal issues, and concluded that the Commission's decision erred as a matter of law in several respects:

- By placing the burden on the claimants to establish that they should not be disqualified for benefits due to a stoppage of work caused by the strike. *See* Claimants I Decision on Appeal at 14-19, R. 2016-21.
- By failing to apply the "substantial curtailment" standard in determining the existence of a work stoppage. *See* Claimants I Decision on Appeal at 9-14, R. 2011-16.
- By failing to making a separate determination, as to each week of the strike, whether a work stoppage occurred. *See* Claimants I Decision on Appeal at 22, R. 2024.

The grounds for remand in Claimants I all involved issues of law. Although the Petitioners also challenged the Commission's factual findings, the remand on issues of law obviated any need to address that challenge. R. at 2010.

The Commission's Decision on Remand

On remand, the Commission re-evaluated the Petitioners' claims for unemployment benefits, based on the same evidentiary record developed during the Claimants I proceedings before the Commission, and again denied the Petitioners' claims. *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1794-1850.

The Commission's decision on remand contains the following components:

- Procedural history: This entailed a summary of the initial proceedings before the Commission and the initial appeal. *Id.*, R. 1794-8.
- Issues Presented: The two issues framed were (1) whether the claimant's unemployment was due to a stoppage of work for purposes of 26 M.R.S. § 1193(4) and whether the employers' experience rating should be charged for benefits paid to any eligible claimant. *Id.*, R. 1798.
- Methodology for Conducting Weekly Analysis on Remand: This section discussed how the Commission evaluated data and information in the record to comply with this court's directive that the Commission determine whether there was a work stoppage for each of the twenty Sunday-through-Saturday benefit weeks during all or part of which the strike occurred. *Id.*, R. 1798-1800.³ "[W]here possible," the Commission extrapolated weekly data from the existing record evidence. *Id.*, R. 1799.
- Legal Standard: This section discussed judicial precedent, up to and including this court's remand decision. *Id.*, R. 1800-03. In this section, the Commission noted that its decision on remand places the burden on the employers, consistent with this court's remand. *Id.*, R. 1801. Also, while the Commission continued to use the "failure to maintain substantially normal operations" as the standard for determining whether a work stoppage exists, it noted that its decision on remand "treats this standard as

³ The strike lasted for 18.5 weeks rather than 20 full weeks, but it began during a benefit week, continued for eighteen more benefit weeks, and ended during a benefit week, so it covered part or all of 20 weeks. *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1799.

synonymous with the ‘substantial curtailment’ standard, as determined by the Court in its remand decision.” *Id.*, R. 1803.

Further, the Commission adopted “a multi-factor analysis, evaluating the following factors to determine whether or not there was a work stoppage in the case at bar: The strike’s impact on business operations and production (including marketing/sales, installations, repairs, construction, maintenance of equipment, and number of employees as compared with normal levels); the strike’s impact on customer satisfaction; and the strike’s impact on revenue. *Id.* Later in its Decision on remand, the Commission developed “metrics,” or numerical measures of different aspects of FairPoint’s operations, based on operations data in the record, and applied the metrics to these factors, along with witness testimony and other evidence.

- Background and General Findings: This section of the decision contained the Commission’s general findings concerning the parties; the history of labor negotiations, and an overview of the strike. *Id.*, R. 1804–08.

- Baseline Findings: This section contained the Commission’s findings regarding the employers’ “normal operations,” *i.e.*, the baseline that, as this court’s remand decision pointed out, necessarily has to be established in order for there to be any determination of a “failure to maintain substantially normal operations.” *Id.*, R. 1808–19. *See* Claimants I Decision on Appeal, at 23, R. 2025.

As a result of its baseline analysis, the Commission developed a baseline figure for each of the numerical metrics that the Commission identified as relevant to

determining whether there was a stoppage of work during each week. *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1818-19. These metrics include average intervals for repairs and installations as well as the number of repairs and installations performed, as well as pending repairs, customer complaints to the Maine Public Utilities Commission, and revenues. *Id.*

- Impact of the Strike, with Week by Week Analysis: The next thirty pages of the Commission's decision on remand set forth the Commission's analysis of evidence, beginning with evidence applicable to all weeks of the strike and continuing with a separate analysis as to each of the weeks of the strike. *Id.*, R. 1819-49. The Commission found that FairPoint's operations declined on the first day of the strike; that delays and backlogs in installations and repairs climbed substantially; that FairPoint suffered substantial losses in terms of customers and revenues during the strike, and that the number of complaints to the Maine Public Utilities Commission rose significantly as a result of the strike. *See id.*

- Conclusion: Based on its analysis, the Commission on remand concluded that

the employers were not able to maintain substantially normal operations during any of the benefit weeks fully or partially covered by the strike period. Based on the totality of the evidence, the Commission concludes that the employers have met their burden to prove that a work stoppage existed due to the strike within the meaning of 26 M.R.S. Section 1193(4) for each of the benefit weeks fully or partially within the strike period.

Id., R. 1849.

The Commission went on to point out that, because it had concluded that there

was a stoppage of work throughout the strike, it was unnecessary to consider the alternate basis upon which a claimant may be disqualified during a strike—a stoppage of work would have existed had the employer not maintained substantially normal operations without hiring new employees to do work previously done by striking employees. *Id.* See 26 M.R.S. § 1193(4).

Based on its conclusion, the Commission affirmed its initial decision and declared all of the Petitioners disqualified because their unemployment throughout the strike was due to a stoppage of work. See Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1849.

The Petitioners have taken a timely appeal from the Commission's decision on remand.

The Record on Appeal

As noted above, most of the record on the present appeal—volumes one through six, covering pages R. 1 through R. 1793—consists of the same record on appeal in Claimants I. The additional components of the record in this appeal—in volumes seven and eight—are materials admitted or offered into the record before the Commission during the proceedings after remand.

Because the Claimants I appeal and the present appeal involve virtually the same evidentiary record, this Decision on Appeal After Remand incorporates by reference the factual summary and legal analysis contained in this court's Decision on Appeal in Claimants I, R. 2002-22, and does not repeat them here.

Issues on Appeal

Whereas the grounds for appeal in Claimants I consisted mainly of issues of law, the points that Petitioners raise in the present appeal are highly fact- and evidence-specific. The Petitioners' brief on appeal raises and addresses the following arguments:

"A. The Commission erred in ignoring the totality of the evidence, which demonstrates that FairPoint maintained substantially normal operations during the strike." Petitioners' Brief at 8

"B. The Commission's determination of the impact of the strike on FairPoint during each week of the strike is not supported by substantial evidence and is premised on an error of law." *Id.* at 12

"C. The Commission's determination of FairPoint's 'substantially normal operations' prior to the strike is not supported by substantial evidence and is premised on an error of law." *Id.* at 20.

"D. The record data as to installations concerns POTS, only one of FairPoint's three main lines of business, and the Commission erred in relying on this data in determining whether there was a work stoppage because of the strike." *Id.* at 28.

"E. The increase in PUC complaints was insignificant and the Commission erred in giving this data any weight in determining whether there was a work stoppage because of the strike." *Id.* at 29.

"F. The Commission erred when it found that the labor dispute caused a work stoppage despite the impact of severe winter weather on the Company's operations." *Id.* at 30.

“G. The employers failed to carry their burden of proving that they maintained substantially normal operations without hiring new personnel to perform work previously done by the striking employees.” *Id.* at 35.

The Commission and FairPoint dispute each of the Petitioners’ contentions. The parties’ arguments are addressed in the *Analysis* section, *infra*, in the order just indicated.

Standard of Review

In reviewing decisions of the Commission, “it is critical that [the court] keep in mind the purposes of the Employment Security Act.” *Brousseau v. Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission*, 470 A.2d 327, 329 (Me. 1984). Because the Act is remedial in nature, it “dictates a liberal construction in favor of the employee.” *Id.*

In general, the court reviews the administrative record “to determine whether the Commission correctly applied the law and whether its fact findings are supported by any competent evidence.” *McPherson Timberlands v. Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission*, 1998 ME 177, ¶ 6, 714 A.2d 818

Based on the nature of the issues raised in this appeal, this court’s role in reviewing factual findings made by the Commission is of particular relevance.

An administrative agency’s findings of fact must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, but the reviewing court “will not overrule findings of fact supported by substantial evidence, defined as ‘such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support the resultant conclusion.’” *Sinclair Builders, Inc. v. Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission*, 2013 ME 76, ¶ 9, 73 A.3d 1061

(quotation omitted). The fact that the record contains inconsistent evidence or the fact that inconsistent conclusions could be drawn from the record do not prevent the agency's findings from being supported by substantial evidence. *See In re Me. Clean Fuels, Inc.*, 310 A.2d 736, 741 (Me. 1973).

Questions as to the credibility of evidence are for the agency, as factfinder, not for the court, to resolve. *See Merrow v. Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission*, 495 A.2d 1197, 1201 (Me. 1985). It matters not whether the court would have assigned the same weight to evidence in the record or would have drawn the same inferences and conclusions from the evidence, as did the agency.

The degree of deference that this court must accord to the Commission's interpretation and evaluation of the evidence means that the court must uphold the Commission's factual determinations "unless the record before the commission compels a contrary result." *See McPherson Timberlands*, 1998 ME 177, ¶ 6, 714 A.2d 818.

On the other hand, an administrative agency "must rely on evidence, not speculation, in fact-finding," *Hannum v. Board of Environmental Protection*, 2003 ME 123, ¶15 n.6, 832 A.2d 765. An administrative agency errs as a matter of law if its

findings of fact are based on speculation. *See Uliano v. Board of Environmental Protection*, 2005 ME 88, ¶ 19 n.6, 876 A.2d 16.

Analysis

With this framework in mind, this Decision On Appeal After Remand addresses each of the Petitioner’s contentions on appeal.

A. Whether the Totality of the Evidence Compelled the Commission to Decide In Favor of Petitioners

Petitioners’ first contention—that the Commission ignored the totality of the evidence in deciding against them, *see* Petitioners’ Brief at 8-12—implicates the deferential standard of review just set forth.

Although an administrative agency is required to consider all of the relevant evidence before it in an adjudicative proceeding, it is for the agency, not the reviewing court, to decide which evidence is of sufficient weight and probative value to figure in the agency’s decision. Thus, judicial review focuses less upon whether an agency decision comports with the totality—meaning the greater quantity—of the evidence, and more upon whether there is substantial evidence in the record supporting the agency’s findings of fact, even if other evidence does not support the findings.

In any event, the evidence that the Petitioners argue that the Commission ignored falls into two categories—evidence that “FairPoint delivered services throughout the 18.5-week labor dispute on time to the vast majority of its 200,000 Maine customers,” and evidence that FairPoint’s management made statements indicating “how well the Company fared during the strike.”

However, the Commission did address the timeliness of FairPoint's service to customers during the strike. It determined that "the totality of the evidence reflects that the employers were continued to struggle with completing services to customers in a reasonably timely manner," and pointed out that management's statements during an earnings call toward the end of the strike "further reflect that the employers believed that they had been unable to provide reasonable service levels during much of the strike period and had been unable to stabilize revenue." *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1806 n.14, 1807.

Moreover, the Commission's week-by-week metrics analysis includes findings based on objective data, rather than subjective impressions, that FairPoint's service to customers, measured in terms of repair and installation times and order backlogs, declined substantially during the strike below the baseline levels that the Commission had developed. *See id.*, R. 1819-49. (Petitioners challenge the metrics developed by the Commission as speculative and lacking support in record evidence, but this is a different issue and is discussed below). Thus, the totality of evidence is not so one-sided that it compels a decision against FairPoint and in favor of the Petitioners.

Admittedly, there is evidence in the record—including but not limited to the two categories of evidence cited by Petitioners—on which the Commission could have grounded its decision, but the court cannot say that the Commission was compelled to accept that evidence over the evidence that it chose instead to rely upon. Accordingly, this ground for the appeal does not justify setting aside the Commission's decision on remand.

- B. Whether the Commission's determination of the impact of the strike on FairPoint during each week of the strike is speculative, not supported by substantial evidence and premised on an error of law.

Petitioners contend that the Commission committed an error of law and also made findings not supported by substantial evidence, in purporting to develop weekly metrics data. Petitioners' Brief at 12-20. With one exception—trouble and order backlogs—the data in the record before the Commission was in monthly or bimonthly format rather than weekly format.

The Commission's decision on remand addresses this issue in the Methodology for Conducting Weekly Analysis, *see* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1798-1800. The Commission indicated that it converted monthly or bimonthly data to weekly data in two different ways:

If it would not be appropriate to break the monthly total down and assign a portion of the monthly figure to individual benefit weeks, the Commission has used the monthly total for each of the benefit weeks that fall within that month. . . .

If it would be appropriate to break the monthly total down and assign a portion of the monthly total to individual benefit weeks, the Commission has arrived at weekly data for the benefit weeks at issue in this matter by dividing the monthly figure by the number of days in the month and then multiplying by seven.

Id., R. 1799-1800.

In substance, the Commission extrapolated, in these two ways, weekly figures from monthly or bimonthly data to apply to its week-by-week analysis (as well as its determination of the operational baseline). The question presented on judicial review is whether the extrapolation was reasonable and yielded substantial evidence of

weekly operations levels, or whether it was unreasonable and resulted in speculation, as the Petitioners contend.

As the Commission's brief points out, it was constrained to utilize the monthly or bimonthly data already in the record by the court's directive to reconsider its decision on remand based on the current record. *See* Brief on Behalf of Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission In Opposition to Rule 80C Petition ["Commission Brief"] at 14-15. Moreover, according to FairPoint's brief to the Commission, the evidence already in the record was "the best evidence available to evaluate the strike's effect on a week-by-week basis," because, with few exceptions, weekly data for the various metrics utilized by the Commission was not maintained during the strike. *See* Employers' Response to Procedural Order No. 2 at 5 & n.9, R. 1878 & n.9.

The Petitioners' primary objection to the Commission's conversion of monthly or bimonthly data to weekly figures is that the conversion assumes limited or no variation from week to week during the strike. On the other hand, Petitioners have not pointed to evidence in the record that there was, in fact, such variation in the various metrics from week to week as to render the Commission's averaging approach unreasonable and speculative. Averaging monthly or bimonthly data to develop weekly numbers is not an inherently irrational or unreasonable method, and in this case, it appears to have been the only way to develop weekly figures.

The questions before the court are whether the Commission acted arbitrarily or capriciously in converting the monthly or bimonthly data to weekly data and was

compelled to decide that reliable weekly metrics could not be developed from the monthly and bimonthly data in the record. The court concludes that the Commission's method of developing weekly data for both the baseline periods and the weeks of the strike was not unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious. Thus, the court does not view the Commission's reliance on weekly data extrapolated from monthly data as grounds to set aside the Commission's decision.

C. Whether the Commission's determination of FairPoint's 'substantially normal operations' prior to the strike is supported by substantial evidence or is premised on an error of law.

The Petitioners challenge the Commission's determination of the baseline "substantially normal operations" that is a prerequisite for determining whether a stoppage of work due to the strike had occurred in any week. Petitioners' Brief at 20-28. Their challenge has several components.

First, they point out that the Commission used data covering as many as 45 months and converted that data to a monthly average, and then converted the monthly average into weekly numbers. They say this approach ignores the fact that data for particular metrics can vary from month to month—as, for example, between seasons of the year—and can further vary from week to week. Thus, this argument rests on much the same foundation as their contention that the Commission should not have attempted to extrapolate weekly metrics from monthly or bimonthly data.

Second, the Petitioners point out that the record contained only five weeks of pre-strike data for the two metrics for which weekly data exists in the record—the

trouble load and order load—and contend that five weeks of data is an insufficient predicate for a baseline determination.

As a result, the Petitioners contend, the Commission engaged in speculation and thereby committed an error of law.

Clear seasonal variations in the monthly data might call into doubt the Commission's use of a single monthly average figure based on 12 or 33 or 45 months of data and might indicate that the Commission should instead have focused on the data during the pre-strike period for the months of October through February—the same months as were encompassed by the strike.

However, the monthly data in the record do not appear to reflect the kind of consistent seasonal variation that would call into question the Commission's use of a single monthly average based on 12 months or more of data. The monthly figures are reproduced in table format in the baseline section of the Commission's decision on remand. *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1809-14. The figures plainly show some monthly fluctuations over the course of the calendar year, but the fluctuations do not appear to be consistent or seasonal. Thus, it cannot be said the Commission acted unreasonably in using an average monthly figure to develop a baseline level for the various metrics.

Regarding the five weeks of trouble load and order load data, the Commission could well have decided that the data were insufficient for purposes of developing a baseline operations level, but such a conclusion would have excluded just two of the metrics from the analysis. Moreover, the Commission could have decided that the

data, albeit quite limited in duration, were sufficiently representative of pre-strike operations to be serve as the basis for the baseline metrics for trouble load and order load.

Accordingly, for reasons similar to those reflected in the court's analysis in the preceding section, the court concludes that the Commission did not act arbitrarily or capriciously, or commit any error of law, in its baseline methodology, and that there is substantial evidence in the record supporting the Commission's baseline metrics.

D. Whether the record data as to installations concerns POTS, only one of FairPoint's three main lines of business, and, if so, whether the Commission erred in relying on this data in determining whether there was a work stoppage because of the strike.

Petitioners also say that the Commission should not have relied upon the installation metrics that it developed to measure the number and timing of residential and business installations, because the data underlying the metrics reflected only one of FairPoint's three lines of business—POTS (Plain Old Telephone Service). *See* Petitioners' Brief at 28-29. The other two lines are broadband service for residential and business customers and carrier Ethernet service for very large business customers.

Assuming, as appears to be the case, that the installation metrics were based only on POTS installations as Petitioners contend, the metrics should not be given dispositive weight, because they reflect only a portion of FairPoint's operations. But that is as far as the Petitioners' argument goes. Given that the metrics were based on a reasonable extrapolation of installation data before and during the strike, the Commission did not err in considering them. The Commission decision indicates that

the Commission understood that the installation data related only to POTS installations. *See* R. 1813, 1815. In addition, as the Commission's brief points out, the Commission did address in its findings the other two lines of FairPoint's business and found, based on FairPoint's testimony, that those lines, too, had been adversely affected during the strike. *See* Commission Brief at 16-17, *citing* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017), R. 1808.

For these reasons, the court cannot say the Commission erred in analyzing and applying the installation metrics.

- E. Whether the Commission erred in giving the volume of PUC complaints any weight in determining whether there was a work stoppage because of the strike.
- F. Whether the Commission erred when it found that the labor dispute caused a work stoppage despite evidence regarding the impact of severe winter weather on FairPoint's operations.

Petitioners' Brief contends that the Commission erred in its handling of two areas of evidence: evidence of an increase in customer complaints to the Maine PUC about FairPoint during the strike, and evidence of the effects of winter weather on FairPoint's operations. Petitioners' Brief at 29-34. The Petitioners argue that the Commission should have given less or no weight to the increase in PUC complaints, *id.* at 29 and should have given more or dispositive weight to the impact of winter weather upon FairPoint's operations. *Id.* at 30-34. Both contentions are addressed together here because they implicate the same deferential standard of review.

In assessing whether the strike affected the number of customer complaints to the PUC, the Commission found that the number of PUC complaints had increased by

multiples of up to seven in the course of the strike. This court is largely in agreement with the Petitioners that using raw data regarding customer complaints is not the best means of either developing a baseline of substantially normal operations or measuring the impact of a strike on operations. The Commission's other metrics bear much more directly at the appropriate baseline level and at the effects of the strike. As Petitioners point out, "complaints are not proof of a work stoppage," Petitioners' Brief at 33 n.88. Absent evidence that the increase in PUC complaints was due to delays or other byproducts of the strike, the increase is better viewed as corroborative of other metrics rather than as probative in and of itself.

Still, there was an undeniable spike in the number of complaints during the first month of the strike, in October 2014, and the number of complaints per month escalated each month until dropping in February, when the strike ended. *See* R. 1812-13. The court cannot say the Commission either erred or acted arbitrarily or capriciously in considering the increase as evidence that FairPoint was not operating at a substantially normal level.

Similarly, this court might have evaluated the impact of winter weather on the strike differently. As Petitioners point out, FairPoint management specifically acknowledged that severe winter weather had delayed the company's restoration of normal operations. Petitioners' Brief at 33 n. 89. The Commission might have taken this evidence to indicate that, in the later weeks of the strike, FairPoint's failure to maintain substantially normal operations was due to adverse weather rather than due to the strike.

However, the Commission did consider the effects of the four major winter storms in November and December 2014 and January and February 2015. *See id.*, R. 1826-29, 1833-34, 1835, 1843, 1846-47. The question on judicial review is whether the Commission was compelled by the evidence to make findings contrary to those it did make on this issue, and the court cannot say that it was.

- G. Whether the Commission should have determined that the employers failed to carry their burden of proving that they maintained substantially normal operations without hiring new personnel to perform work previously done by the striking employees.

Petitioners say that the Commission should have addressed both of the section 1193(4) grounds for disqualifying a claimant due a strike. The two grounds are that “the claimant's total or partial unemployment is due to a stoppage of work that exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment or other premises at which the claimant is or was employed, or there would have been a stoppage of work had substantially normal operations not been maintained with other personnel previously and currently employed by the same employer and any other additional personnel that the employer may hire to perform tasks not previously done by the striking employees.” *See* 26 M.R.S. § 1193(4).

The Commission decided that FairPoint had proved that the Petitioners should be disqualified from benefits because there *was* a stoppage of work due to the strike throughout the 20-week benefit period at issue, and therefore decided that it did not need to address the question of whether there would have been a stoppage. *See id.*, R. 1849. The Petitioners contend that the Commission should have found no stoppage of

work and should have gone on to address the second section 1193(4) ground for disqualification. Petitioners' Brief at 35-39.

The Commission and FairPoint dispute this argument. The Commission's brief says that the court should affirm the Commission's Decision and not reach the alternative ground for disqualification under section 1193(4). *See* Commission Brief at 18-19. FairPoint's brief addresses the alternative provision of section 1193(4) on its merits, and contends that Petitioners would still be disqualified. Brief of Parties-In-Interest at 4-7.

Given that the court is affirming the Commission's decision that FairPoint has proved that there was a work stoppage due to the strike during the benefit weeks at issue, the court sees no reason to go further and address issues relating to the second part of section 1193(4).⁴

Conclusion

For the reasons stated, the court concludes that the Commission's decision after remand was supported by substantial evidence in the record and was not arbitrary or capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion, and therefore should be affirmed.

⁴ The Petitioners' Brief and FairPoint's Brief advance differing interpretations of the alternative ground for disqualification contained in section 1193(4). FairPoint's position is that the Petitioners would still be disqualified because there would have been a work stoppage had FairPoint not used non-striking employees and temporary workers to maintain substantially normal operations and because FairPoint did not permanently replace the striking employees. FairPoint Brief at 4-5. Petitioners' position is that it does not matter whether they were permanently replaced—they would be entitled to benefits because, even if there would have been a work stoppage, FairPoint maintained substantially normal operations in part through the use of temporary workers hired to do work previously done by the striking employees. Which interpretation is correct need not be decided here.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The appeal of the Claimants whose cases are listed in the attachment to this Decision from the denial of their claims for unemployment compensation is hereby denied. *See* Me. Unemp't. Ins. Comm'n. Dec. No. 16-C-05251 (Aug. 31, 2017).
2. The Commission decision denying the individual claims listed in the attachment to this Decision is hereby affirmed. *See id.*
3. Judgment is hereby entered for the Defendant Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission.

Pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 79(a), the Clerk is hereby directed to incorporate this Decision on Appeal After Remand by reference in the docket.

Dated June 5, 2018



A.M. Horton
Justice, Business & Consumer Court

Entered on the Docket: 6-5-18
Copies sent via Mail Electronically

	A	B	C
1	FAIRPOINT		
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
3	2015 C 04220	Adams, Melissa A	Melissa A Adams v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
4	2015 C 04221	Allen, Shawna K	Shawna K Allen v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
5	2015 C 04222	Amergian, Ani T	Ani T Amergian v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
6	2015 C 04223	Amoroso, Julie M	Julie M Amoroso v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
7	2015 C 04224	Anderson, Sarah L	Sarah L Anderson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
8	2015 C 04225	Arnold, Robin M	Robin M Arnold v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
9	2015 C 04226	Ashley, Jenni-lynn M	Jenni-lynn M Ashley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
10	2015 C 04227	Baldwin, Kasey L	Kasey L Baldwin v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
11	2015 C 04228	Baron, Susan A	Susan A Baron v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
12	2015 C 04230	Beam, Mary E	Mary E Beam v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
13	2015 C 04231	Beckwith-foster, Mary	Mary Beckwith-foster v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
14	2015 C 04229	Bedard, Lynda V	Lynda V Bedard v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
15	2015 C 04234	Bentley, Kimberly A	Kimberly A Bentley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
16	2015 C 04232	Berry Clark, Elizabeth J	Elizabeth J Berry Clark v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
17	2015 C 04235	Birney, Karen	Karen Birney v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
18	2015 C 04236	Black, Susan J	Susan J Black v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
19	2015 C 04237	Blake, Brooke A	Brooke A Blake v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
20	2015 C 04238	Blomquist, Robert N	Robert N Blomquist v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
21	2015 C 04239	Bogan, Elaine D	Elaine D Bogan v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
22	2015 C 04240	Boles, Michele	Michele Boles v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
23	2015 C 04241	Bolton, Linda D	Linda D Bolton v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
24	2015 C 04243	Bourget, Jean C	Jean C Bourget v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
25	2015 C 04244	Bradbury, Kathryn L	Kathryn L Bradbury v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
26	2015 C 04245	Bragg, Randy E	Randy E Bragg v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
27	2015 C 04246	Brayall, Danielle	Danielle Brayall v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
2			
28	2015 C 04247	Breslin, John T	John T Breslin v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
29	2015 C 04250	Brichetto, Stacy M	Stacy M Brichetto v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
30	2015 C 04252	Briggs, Gretchen L	Gretchen L Briggs v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
31	2015 C 04253	Bronson, Elyse M	Elyse M Bronson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
32	2015 C 04255	Brown, Ann M	Ann M Brown v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
33	2015 C 04257	Brown, Dawn L	Dawn L Brown v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
34	2015 C 04259	Brown, Jenna M	Jenna M Brown v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
35	2015 C 04262	Brown, Marie T	Marie T Brown v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
36	2015 C 04264	Brown, Rita A	Rita A Brown v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
37	2015 C 04265	Bureau, Patrick N	Patrick N Bureau v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
38	2015 C 04268	Burgess, Kimberley A	Kimberley A Burgess v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
39	2015 C 04269	Cabot, Allison A	Allison A Cabot v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
40	2015 C 04270	Campbell, Danielle	Danielle Campbell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
41	2015 C 04272	Cangley, Lori	Lori Cangley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
42	2015 C 04274	Carr, Kathie A	Kathie A Carr v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
43	2015 C 04276	Casale, Stacey H	Stacey H Casale v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
44	2015 C 04279	Caswell, Terrence A	Terrence A Caswell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
45	2015 C 04280	Cerqueira, Mara L	Mara L Cerqueira v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
46	2015 C 04281	Charpentier, Tina M	Tina M Charpentier v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
47	2015 C 04283	Church, Rhonda L	Rhonda L Church v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
48	2015 C 04286	Cloutier, Mark E	Mark E Cloutier v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
49	2015 C 04287	Cloutier, Nicole P	Nicole P Cloutier v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
50	2015 C 04288	Cogswell, Laurie L	Laurie L Cogswell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
51	2015 C 04289	Coleman, Herman L	Herman L Coleman v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
52	2015 C 04290	Conley, Kevin	Kevin Conley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
53	2015 C 04291	Crabtree, Justin P	Justin P Crabtree v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
54	2015 C 04292	Crosby, Jeffrey D	Jeffrey D Crosby v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
55	2015 C 04293	Cunningham, Crystal M	Crystal M Cunningham v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
56	2015 C 04294	Cunningham, Deborah L	Deborah L Cunningham v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
57	2015 C 04295	Curtis, Brenda A	Brenda A Curtis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
58	2015 C 04297	Curtis, Randall L	Randall L Curtis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
59	2015 C 04298	Davis, Andrew J	Andrew J Davis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
60	2015 C 04299	Davis, Jessica T	Jessica T Davis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
61	2015 C 04300	Davis, Kathleen M	Kathleen M Davis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
62	2015 C 04301	Davis, Paula L	Paula L Davis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
63	2015 C 04303	Dempsey, Melissa A	Melissa A Dempsey v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
64	2015 C 04306	Dennis, Lisa	Lisa Dennis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
65	2015 C 04307	Deroche, Rebecca R	Rebecca R Deroche v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
66	2015 C 04310	Desjardins, Paula A	Paula A Desjardins v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
67	2015 C 04313	Dewolfe, Serina M	Serina M Dewolfe v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
68	2015 C 04316	Difillipo, Danielle J	Danielle J Difillipo v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
69	2015 C 04318	Dillingham, Davida L	Davida L Dillingham v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
70	2015 C 04321	Dionne Neal, Cheri L	Cheri L Dionne Neal v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
71	2015 C 04324	Dobrowolski, William D	William D Dobrowolski v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
72	2015 C 04326	Dorazio, Mary M	Mary M Dorazio v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
73	2015 C 04328	Dubail, Julie A	Julie A Dubail v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
74	2015 C 04329	Dube, Tammy J	Tammy J Dube v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
75	2015 C 04330	Dubois, Kelly M	Kelly M Dubois v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
76	2015 C 04331	Dugas, Renee A	Renee A Dugas v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
77	2015 C 04332	Dunphy, Michelle	Michelle Dunphy v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
78	2015 C 04333	Dunshee, Randy	Randy Dunshee v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
79	2015 C 04336	Elizabeth, Jennifer	Jennifer Elizabeth v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
2			
80	2015 C 04337	Elliott, Mary Jo	Mary Jo Elliott v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
81	2015 C 04338	Emery, Christopher A	Christopher A Emery v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
82	2015 C 04339	Enaire, Matthew L	Matthew L Enaire v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
83	2015 C 04340	Ennis, Theresa P	Theresa P Ennis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
84	2015 C 04341	Esposito, Estella J	Estella J Esposito v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
85	2015 C 04342	Falconieri, Debra L	Debra L Falconieri v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
86	2015 C 04343	Farley, Amy L	Amy L Farley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
87	2015 C 04344	Feeney, Sara J	Sara J Feeney v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
88	2015 C 04345	Fickett, Tina M	Tina M Fickett v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
89	2015 C 04347	Fitts, Bethany J	Bethany J Fitts v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
90	2015 C 04348	Flaherty, Janet M	Janet M Flaherty v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
91	2015 C 04349	Florey, Richard W	Richard W Florey v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
92	2015 C 04350	Foss, Candi T	Candi T Foss v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
93	2015 C 04351	Gabri, Pamela	Pamela Gabri v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
94	2015 C 04352	Gagne, Lance R	Lance R Gagne v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
95	2015 C 04353	Gagnon, Larry G	Larry G Gagnon v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
96	2015 C 04354	Getchell, Melissa M	Melissa M Getchell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
97	2015 C 04357	Gibson, April D	April D Gibson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
98	2015 C 04358	Goodwin, Anna M	Anna M Goodwin v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
99	2015 C 04360	Gosselin, Jennifer L	Jennifer L Gosselin v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
100	2015 C 04361	Grandmont, Lynann M	Lynann M Grandmont v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
101	2015 C 04362	Granger, Carol A	Carol A Granger v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
102	2015 C 04363	Grant, Marci J	Marci J Grant v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
103	2015 C 04364	Gray, Cheryl	Cheryl Gray v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
104	2015 C 04365	Gray, Jennifer	Jennifer Gray v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
105	2015 C 04367	Greenwood, Jean M	Jean M Greenwood v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
106	2015 C 04369	Grindle, Linda R	Linda R Grindle v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
107	2015 C 04371	Grondin, Donna L	Donna L Grondin v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
108	2015 C 04373	Guay, Cindy L	Cindy L Guay v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
109	2015 C 04375	Gullatt, Mary C	Mary C Gullatt v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
110	2015 C 04376	Gushee, Kelly A	Kelly A Gushee v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
111	2015 C 04377	Hall, Charles J	Charles J Hall v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
112	2015 C 04379	Hall, Loriann M	Loriann M Hall v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
113	2015 C 04381	Hall-robinson, Deanna R	Deanna R Hall-robinson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
114	2015 C 04382	Harmon, Colleen A	Colleen A Harmon v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
115	2015 C 04383	Harrison, Joshua J	Joshua J Harrison v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
116	2015 C 04384	Higgins, Vanessa L	Vanessa L Higgins v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
117	2015 C 04387	Hill, Stephanie	Stephanie Hill v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
118	2015 C 04388	Hill, Victoria L	Victoria L Hill v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
119	2015 C 04385	Hilton, Amanda C	Amanda C Hilton v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
120	2015 C 04390	Hoard, Cynthia J	Cynthia J Hoard v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
121	2015 C 04391	Hogan, Theresa	Theresa Hogan v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
122	2015 C 04389	Howell, Heidi J	Heidi J Howell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
123	2015 C 04392	Jansmann, Irene	Irene Jansmann v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
124	2015 C 04393	Jensen, Krista	Krista Jensen v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
125	2015 C 04394	Johnson, Joshua S	Joshua S Johnson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
126	2015 C 04395	Johnston, Nicole R	Nicole R Johnston v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
127	2015 C 04396	Jones, Amanda	Amanda Jones v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
128	2015 C 04398	Jones, Cherie Lee	Cherie Lee Jones v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
129	2015 C 04400	Keams-rogers, Sandra	Sandra Kearns-rogers v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
130	2015 C 04171	Lacroix, Shelly	Shelly Lacroix v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
131	2015 C 04172	Langlois, Claire M	Claire M Langlois v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
2			
132	2015 C 04173	Lawrence, Julie M	Julie M Lawrence v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
133	2015 C 04174	Lebel, Patricia J	Patricia J Lebel v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
134	2015 C 04175	Leicht, Peter L	Peter L Leicht v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
135	2015 C 04176	Lemieux, Scott A	Scott A Lemieux v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
136	2015 C 04177	Leonard, Jennifer A	Jennifer A Leonard v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
137	2015 C 04178	Libby, Lori A	Lori A Libby v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
138	2015 C 04179	Long, Michelle R	Michelle R Long v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
139	2015 C 04180	Lyman, Amber L	Amber L Lyman v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
140	2015 C 04181	Lynds, Laurieanne	Laurieanne Lynds v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
141	2015 C 04182	Maguire, Lisa M	Lisa M Maguire v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
142	2015 C 04183	Mank, Meghan P	Meghan P Mank v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
143	2015 C 04184	Marquis, Brandy D	Brandy D Marquis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
144	2015 C 04185	Martinson, Wade A	Wade A Martinson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
145	2015 C 04187	Mcaloon, Theresa	Theresa Mcaloon v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
146	2015 C 04200	Mcclelland, Barney F	Barney F Mcclelland v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
147	2015 C 04188	Mcgowan, Jennifer E	Jennifer E Mcgowan v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
148	2015 C 04189	Mcguire, Valerie L	Valerie L Mcguire v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
149	2015 C 04190	Mckay, Michael E	Michael E McKay v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
150	2015 C 04192	Mckeever, Teresa E	Teresa E Mckeever v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
151	2015 C 04201	Mcray, Francine M	Francine M Mcray v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
152	2015 C 04202	Michaud, Denise M	Denise M Michaud v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
153	2015 C 04203	Miller, Heather R	Heather R Miller v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
154	2015 C 04204	Mills, Schuyler	Schuyler Mills v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
155	2015 C 04205	Morehead, Franklin B	Franklin B Morehead v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
156	2015 C 04206	Morgan, Heather J	Heather J Morgan v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
157	2015 C 04210	Morin, Lisa L	Lisa L Morin v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
158	2015 C 04211	Mosley, Michael W	Michael W Mosley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
159	2015 C 04212	Mullen, Heather	Heather Mullen v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
160	2015 C 04213	Munsen, Jonathan B	Jonathan B Munsen v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
161	2015 C 04214	Murphy, Ann N	Ann N Murphy v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
162	2015 C 04215	Murphy, Ellen L	Ellen L Murphy v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
163	2015 C 04216	Murray, Glenn D	Glenn D Murray v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
164	2015 C 04217	Murray-palmer, Mistyn D	Mistyn D Murray-palmer v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
165	2015 C 04218	Mutty-bessey, Robert M	Robert M Mutty-bessey v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
166	2015 C 04219	Myrbeck, Laurie S	Laurie S Myrbeck v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
167	2015 C 04249	Nadeau, Angel A	Angel A Nadeau v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
168	2015 C 04251	Newcomb, Alec S	Alec S Newcomb v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
169	2015 C 04254	Newey, Patricia J	Patricia J Newey v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
170	2015 C 04256	Nice, Suzannah	Suzannah Nice v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
171	2015 C 04258	Nordli, Susan A	Susan A Nordli v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
172	2015 C 04260	Norton, Suzan L	Suzan L Norton v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
173	2015 C 04261	Nunn, Erin	Erin Nunn v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
174	2015 C 04263	Oconnor, Heather L	Heather L Oconnor v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
175	2015 C 04266	Oneil, Tania	Tania Oneil v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
176	2015 C 04271	Osmolski, Tricia M	Tricia M Osmolski v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
177	2015 C 04273	Pascucci, Erica	Erica Pascucci v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
178	2015 C 04275	Pavliko, Paulette	Paulette Pavliko v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
179	2015 C 04278	Perkins, Mary L	Mary L Perkins v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
180	2015 C 04282	Peterson, Robert A	Robert A Peterson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
181	2015 C 04284	Philpot, Ann M	Ann M Philpot v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
182	2015 C 04285	Pierce, Elizabeth H	Elizabeth H Pierce v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
183	2015 C 04302	Piersol, Brenda M	Brenda M Piersol v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
2			
184	2015 C 04304	Pietrowicz, James	James Pietrowicz v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
185	2015 C 04305	Provencher, Diane D	Diane D Provencher v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
186	2015 C 04355	Raymond, Sandra L	Sandra L Raymond v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
187	2015 C 04356	Rice, Robin M	Robin M Rice v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
188	2015 C 04359	Ricker, Roxanne M	Roxanne M Ricker v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
189	2015 C 04366	Roberts, Travis W	Travis W Roberts v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
190	2015 C 04368	Rosendo, Kim S	Kim S Rosendo v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
191	2015 C 04370	Ross, Anthony M	Anthony M Ross v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
192	2015 C 04372	Ruel, Robin	Robin Ruel v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
193	2015 C 04374	Ruksznis, Danielle	Danielle Ruksznis v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
194	2015 C 04378	Sabine, Alison R	Alison R Sabine v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
195	2015 C 04380	Saldana, David	David Saldana v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
196	2015 C 04399	Saunders, Patricia A	Patricia A Saunders v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
197	2015 C 04401	Savage-wilson, Jodi	Jodi Savage-wilson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
198	2015 C 04402	Sawtelle, Julie A	Julie A Sawtelle v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
199	2015 C 04403	Scala, Julie	Julie Scala v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
200	2015 C 04404	Scherer, Susan A	Susan A Scherer v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
201	2015 C 04405	Segal, Joleen	Joleen Segal v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
202	2015 C 04406	Segal, Maria J	Maria J Segal v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
203	2015 C 04407	Shackley, Christine M	Christine M Shackley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
204	2015 C 04408	Shackley, Richard A	Richard A Shackley v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
205	2015 C 04409	Shain, Christopher T	Christopher T Shain v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
206	2015 C 04410	Shea, Christopher E	Christopher E Shea v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
207	2015 C 04411	Sheehan, Kandy-sue	Kandy-sue Sheehan v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
208	2015 C 04412	Smith, Amie C	Amie C Smith v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
209	2015 C 04413	Smith, Dawna M	Dawna M Smith v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
2			
210	2015 C 04414	Smith, Shay F	Shay F Smith v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
211	2015 C 04416	Spalding, Megan M	Megan M Spalding v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
212	2015 C 04419	Sparks, Rita A	Rita A Sparks v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
213	2015 C 04421	Stacy, Deborah A	Deborah A Stacy v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
214	2015 C 04423	Stevens, Donna	Donna Stevens v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
215	2015 C 04424	Stewart, Ronald W	Ronald W Stewart v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
216	2015 C 04425	Sweret, Pamela	Pamela Sweret v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
217	2015 C 04427	Talbot, Kimberly A	Kimberly A Talbot v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
218	2015 C 04493	Tanguay, Janis E	Janis E Tanguay v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
219	2015 C 04429	Tanous, Mary K	Mary K Tanous v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
220	2015 C 04430	Tardif, Maureen A	Maureen A Tardif v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
221	2015 C 04431	Tardiff, Karen A	Karen A Tardiff v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
222	2015 C 04432	Taylor, Jennifer E	Jennifer E Taylor v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
223	2015 C 04433	Telles, Amanda	Amanda Telles v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
224	2015 C 04434	Teras, Nancy A	Nancy A Teras v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
225	2015 C 04435	Thibodeau, Erin F	Erin F Thibodeau v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
226	2015 C 04436	Thibodeau, Kristen M	Kristen M Thibodeau v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
227	2015 C 04437	Tinto, Wendy E	Wendy E Tinto v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
228	2015 C 04438	Tribou, Michael	Michael Tribou v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
229	2015 C 04439	Trudeau, Deborah M	Deborah M Trudeau v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
230	2015 C 04440	True, Melissa	Melissa True v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
231	2015 C 04441	Tucci, Susan	Susan Tucci v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
232	2015 C 04442	Turcotte, Angela L	Angela L Turcotte v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
233	2015 C 04443	Twombly, Judith L	Judith L Twombly v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
234	2015 C 04510	Vachon, Nancy L	Nancy L Vachon v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
235	2015 C 04446	Vanduzer, Susan L	Susan L Vanduzer v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
236	2015 C 04447	Waddell, Sherry L	Sherry L Waddell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
237	2015 C 04448	Wainer, Charlotte L	Charlotte L Wainer v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
238	2015 C 04449	Wardwell, Evelyn G	Evelyn G Wardwell v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
239	2015 C 04450	Ware, Barbara A	Barbara A Ware v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
240	2015 C 04451	Watson, Linda G	Linda G Watson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
241	2015 C 04452	Watson, Tracy L	Tracy L Watson v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
242	2015 C 04453	Webster, Deborah J	Deborah J Webster v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
243	2015 C 04454	Wescott, Kristen M	Kristen M Wescott v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
244	2015 C 04455	Wilcox, Cheryl A	Cheryl A Wilcox v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
245	2015 C 04456	Willard, Joyce	Joyce Willard v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
246	2015 C 04457	Willey, Renee M	Renee M Willey v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
247	2015 C 06192	Winn, Carol L	Carol L. Winn v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
248	2015 C 04458	Wood, Nathaniel C	Nathaniel C Wood v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
249	2015 C 04459	Woodman, Todd H	Todd H Woodman v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
250	2015 C 04460	Worcester, Brenda J	Brenda J Worcester v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
251	2015 C 04461	Wyman, Susan E	Susan E Wyman v Fairpoint Logistics Inc
252	2015 C 04462	Yuill, Lisa	Lisa Yuill v Fairpoint Logistics Inc

EXHIBIT**2**

	A	B	C
1	NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND		
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
3	2015 C 03847	Adams, Cathleen F	Cathleen F Adams v Northern New England
4	2015 C 03850	Alley, Sheldon E	Sheldon E Alley v Northern New England
5	2015 C 03858	Arsenault, Robert C	Robert C Arsenault v Northern New England
6	2015 C 03844	Aube, Cheryl L	Cheryl L Aube v Northern New England
7	2015 C 03845	Aveau, Richard G	Richard G Aveau v Northern New England
8	2015 C 03860	Ayers, Dale C	Dale C Ayers v Northern New England
9	2015 C 03862	Balboni, Peter J	Peter J Balboni v Northern New England
10	2015 C 03846	Bashaw, David E	David E Bashaw v Northern New England
11	2015 C 03848	Beaulieu, Brian R	Brian R Beaulieu v Northern New England
12	2015 C 03849	Beecy, Michael J	Michael J Beecy v Northern New England
13	2015 C 04233	Belanger, Jaime L	Jaime L Belanger v Northern New England
14	2015 C 03851	Bendure, Raymond B	Raymond B Bendure v Northern New England
15	2015 C 03864	Bickford, Steven G	Steven G Bickford v Northern New England
16	2015 C 03866	Bilodeau, Paul L	Paul L Bilodeau v Northern New England
17	2015 C 03852	Blake, Jayson P	Jayson P Blake v Northern New England
18	2015 C 03868	Blodgett, Herbert E	Herbert E Blodgett v Northern New England
19	2015 C 03853	Bombardier, Kurt	Kurt Bombardier v Northern New England
20	2015 C 03869	Botting, Dawn E	Dawn E Botting v Northern New England
21	2015 C 03871	Boucher, Dale T	Dale T Boucher v Northern New England
22	2015 C 03854	Boudreau, Scott D	Scott D Boudreau v Northern New England
23	2015 C 03855	Boutilier, Lindsay G	Lindsay G Boutilier v Northern New England
24	2015 C 03873	Bowen, Mark W	Mark W Bowen v Northern New England
25	2015 C 03874	Boyd, Melissa A	Melissa A Boyd v Northern New England
26	2015 C 03877	Bryer, Kevin W	Kevin W Bryer v Northern New England
27	2015 C 03856	Buhelt, Dennis A	Dennis A Buhelt v Northern New England
28	2015 C 03857	Byrne, Thomas J	Thomas J Byrne v Northern New England
29	2015 C 03859	Calden, Cathy A	Cathy A Calden v Northern New England
30	2015 C 03861	Campbell, Richard G	Richard G Campbell v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
31	2015 C 03879	Cannell, Karen J	Karen J Cannell v Northern New England
32	2015 C 03881	Caron, Carol	Carol Caron v Northern New England
33	2015 C 03863	Carter, Dominic J	Dominic J Carter v Northern New England
34	2015 C 03882	Caserio, Richard D	Richard D Caserio v Northern New England
35	2015 C 03884	Cash, Dennis M	Dennis M Cash v Northern New England
36	2015 C 03886	Casserly, Brian T	Brian T Casserly v Northern New England
37	2015 C 03865	Celani, Dean	Dean Celani v Northern New England
38	2015 C 03888	Clement, Ronald A	Ronald A Clement v Northern New England
39	2015 C 03867	Clockedile, Scott	Scott Clockedile v Northern New England
40	2015 C 03870	Colligan, Christopher	Christopher Colligan v Northern New England
41	2015 C 03872	Collomy, Steven	Steven Collomy v Northern New England
42	2015 C 03890	Cook, Robert J	Robert J Cook v Northern New England
43	2015 C 03875	Coomey, James J	James J Coomey v Northern New England
44	2015 C 03894	Copeland, Thomas A	Thomas A Copeland v Northern New England
45	2015 C 03876	Crimp, Kevin P	Kevin P Crimp v Northern New England
46	2015 C 03901	Cummings, Leonard W	Leonard W Cummings v Northern New England
47	2015 C 03878	Currier, Charles H	Charles H Currier v Northern New England
48	2015 C 03904	Dakin, Michael W	Michael W Dakin v Northern New England
49	2015 C 03907	Damron, Robin C	Robin C Damron v Northern New England
50	2015 C 03911	Darge, William E	William E Darge v Northern New England
51	2015 C 03913	Dawkins, Julie L	Julie L Dawkins v Northern New England
52	2015 C 03916	Demerchant, Adam L	Adam L Demerchant v Northern New England
53	2015 C 03923	Dempsey, Wesley C	Wesley C Dempsey v Northern New England
54	2015 C 03927	Densmore, William L	William L Densmore v Northern New England
55	2015 C 03930	Denyer, Susan M	Susan M Denyer v Northern New England
56	2015 C 03936	Devine, Rory J	Rory J Devine v Northern New England
57	2015 C 03938	Dimodica, Philip V	Philip V Dimodica v Northern New England
58	2015 C 03940	Dipierro, Charles E	Charles E Dipierro v Northern New England
59	2015 C 03942	Dixon, David E	David E Dixon v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
60	2015 C 03944	Donahue, Eleanor E	Eleanor E Donahue v Northern New England
61	2015 C 03946	Dorn, Jeffrey A	Jeffrey A Dorn v Northern New England
62	2015 C 03880	Dow, Lewis H	Lewis H Dow v Northern New England
63	2015 C 03948	Drake, Brent A	Brent A Drake v Northern New England
64	2015 C 03950	Duchesne, James A	James A Duchesne v Northern New England
65	2015 C 03883	Dunphy, Christopher	Christopher Dunphy v Northern New England
66	2015 C 03953	Earley, Patrick	Patrick Earley v Northern New England
67	2015 C 03955	Eckstein, Shannan M	Shannan M Eckstein v Northern New England
68	2015 C 03956	Edwards, Adam K	Adam K Edwards v Northern New England
69	2015 C 03885	Ehnstrom, Nils T	Nils T Ehnstrom v Northern New England
70	2015 C 03887	Elrick, Stephen A	Stephen A Elrick v Northern New England
71	2015 C 03959	Emery, Robin A	Robin A Emery v Northern New England
72	2015 C 03891	Espling, Craig M	Craig M Espling v Northern New England
73	2015 C 03961	Fagan, Michael J	Michael J Fagan v Northern New England
74	2015 C 03893	Fairbanks, Kelley	Kelley Fairbanks v Northern New England
75	2015 C 03896	Farrell, Donald J	Donald J Farrell v Northern New England
76	2015 C 03899	Feeney, Catherine A	Catherine A Feeney v Northern New England
77	2015 C 03963	Feeney, James H	James H Feeney v Northern New England
78	2015 C 03965	Forni, Paul M	Paul M Forni v Northern New England
79	2015 C 03905	Forslind, David B	David B Forslind v Northern New England
80	2015 C 03925	Fowles, Paul A	Paul A Fowles v Northern New England
81	2015 C 03968	Frank, Reid A	Reid A Frank v Northern New England
82	2015 C 04195	Galipeau, Carol A	Carol A Galipeau v Northern New England
83	2015 C 03931	Gallant, Mary L	Mary L Gallant v Northern New England
84	2015 C 03935	Gibson, Brent	Brent Gibson v Northern New England
85	2015 C 03969	Godin, Danielle S	Danielle S Godin v Northern New England
86	2015 C 03937	Godin, Jami L	Jami L Godin v Northern New England
87	2015 C 03972	Goodall, Thomas D	Thomas D Goodall v Northern New England
88	2015 C 03939	Grant, Rebecca J	Rebecca J Grant v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
89	2015 C 03941	Hall, Victoria L	Victoria L Hall v Northern New England
90	2015 C 03943	Hamblin, Mark E	Mark E Hamblin v Northern New England
91	2015 C 03947	Hanson, Kyle W	Kyle W Hanson v Northern New England
92	2015 C 04198	Hardwick, Steven D	Steven D Hardwick v Northern New England
93	2015 C 03949	Harmon, Jason L	Jason L Harmon v Northern New England
94	2015 C 03951	Hartford, Daniel A	Daniel A Hartford v Northern New England
95	2015 C 03974	Haskell, James O	James O Haskell v Northern New England
96	2015 C 03976	Hauger, David S	David S Hauger v Northern New England
97	2015 C 03952	Hayes, Matthew J	Matthew J Hayes v Northern New England
98	2015 C 03978	Helm, Jonathan R	Jonathan R Helm v Northern New England
99	2015 C 03954	Hinkley, Tina J	Tina J Hinkley v Northern New England
100	2015 C 03957	Hixon, Steven C	Steven C Hixon v Northern New England
101	2015 C 03960	Hodgdon, Christopher	Christopher Hodgdon v Northern New England
102	2015 C 03962	Holyoke, Jason B	Jason B Holyoke v Northern New England
103	2015 C 03980	Hopper, Mark K	Mark K Hopper v Northern New England
104	2015 C 03981	Horne, Joel	Joel Horne v Northern New England
105	2015 C 03964	Hoskins, Kelly R	Kelly R Hoskins v Northern New England
106	2015 C 03966	Hubner, Karen A	Karen A Hubner v Northern New England
107	2015 C 03967	Hughes, Shannon E	Shannon E Hughes v Northern New England
108	2015 C 03982	Hurd, Scott A	Scott A Hurd v Northern New England
109	2015 C 03984	Hutchins, Heidi A	Heidi A Hutchins v Northern New England
110	2015 C 03970	Hutchins, Samuel A	Samuel A Hutchins v Northern New England
111	2015 C 03986	Israel, Matthew	Matthew Israel v Northern New England
112	2015 C 03988	Jansmann, Andrew D	Andrew D Jansmann v Northern New England
113	2015 C 03989	Johnson, Eric M	Eric M Johnson v Northern New England
114	2015 C 03971	Johnson, Joel	Joel Johnson v Northern New England
115	2015 C 03990	Johnson, Thomas A	Thomas A Johnson v Northern New England
116	2015 C 03973	Jolin, Jon R	Jon R Jolin v Northern New England
117	2015 C 03991	Jones, Bennie R	Bennie R Jones v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
118	2015 C 03992	Jones, Stephen B	Stephen B Jones v Northern New England
119	2015 C 03993	Jordan, Calvin A	Calvin A Jordan v Northern New England
120	2015 C 03994	Jordan, Jeffrey H	Jeffrey H Jordan v Northern New England
121	2015 C 04197	Jordon, Joshua J	Joshua J Jordon v Northern New England
122	2015 C 03975	Kalloch, Matthew W	Matthew W Kalloch v Northern New England
123	2015 C 03977	Kane, Daniel S	Daniel S Kane v Northern New England
124	2015 C 04014	Kaspala, Richard H	Richard H Kaspala v Northern New England
125	2015 C 04015	Kidney, Allen R	Allen R Kidney v Northern New England
126	2015 C 04016	Knutson, George A	George A Knutson v Northern New England
127	2015 C 04017	Lailer, Frank I	Frank I Lailer v Northern New England
128	2015 C 04018	Lamoureux, Shawn M	Shawn M Lamoureux v Northern New England
129	2015 C 04020	Laplante, John P	John P Laplante v Northern New England
130	2015 C 04021	Lapointe, Edward J	Edward J Lapointe v Northern New England
131	2015 C 03979	Larochelle, Ryan N	Ryan N Larochelle v Northern New England
132	2015 C 03983	Lawler, Matthew S	Matthew S Lawler v Northern New England
133	2015 C 03985	Lawler, Michael K	Michael K Lawler v Northern New England
134	2015 C 03987	Lawrence, Curtis C	Curtis C Lawrence v Northern New England
135	2015 C 04077	Leary, Stephen P	Stephen P Leary v Northern New England
136	2015 C 04078	Lefebvre, Todd M	Todd M Lefebvre v Northern New England
137	2015 C 04022	Lesniak, Patricia N	Patricia N Lesniak v Northern New England
138	2015 C 04079	Lessard, Neal J	Neal J Lessard v Northern New England
139	2015 C 04080	Levasseur, Peter A	Peter A Levasseur v Northern New England
140	2015 C 04023	Levesque, Scott V	Scott V Levesque v Northern New England
141	2015 C 04081	Lindsay, Craig	Craig Lindsay v Northern New England
142	2015 C 04082	Long, Kevin M	Kevin M Long v Northern New England
143	2015 C 04083	Long, Ralph C	Ralph C Long v Northern New England
144	2015 C 04025	Long, Roger H	Roger H Long v Northern New England
145	2015 C 04084	Luiz, Tyler	Tyler Luiz v Northern New England
146	2015 C 04026	Lunney, Kelly	Kelly Lunney v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
147	2015 C 04029	Macfarlane, Jay D	Jay D Macfarlane v Northern New England
148	2015 C 04085	Madden, Jesse J	Jesse J Madden v Northern New England
149	2015 C 04086	Marden, Craig A	Craig A Marden v Northern New England
150	2015 C 04030	Martin, Melissa L	Melissa L Martin v Northern New England
151	2015 C 04031	Martin, Stephan-minh N	Stephan-minh N Martin v Northern New England
152	2015 C 04032	Martitz, Norman E	Norman E Martitz v Northern New England
153	2015 C 04033	Martitz, Sharon S	Sharon S Martitz v Northern New England
154	2015 C 04034	Mccarthy, Holly M	Holly M Mccarthy v Northern New England
155	2015 C 04035	Mccarthy, John K	John K Mccarthy v Northern New England
156	2015 C 04036	Mccarthy, Stephen E	Stephen E Mccarthy v Northern New England
157	2015 C 04087	Mcgill, James M	James M McGill v Northern New England
158	2015 C 04088	Mclaughlin, Daniel S	Daniel S Mclaughlin v Northern New England
159	2015 C 04037	Mclean, Timothy M	Timothy M Mclean v Northern New England
160	2015 C 04038	Mcquillan, Tyler J	Tyler J Mcquillan v Northern New England
161	2015 C 04039	Merrifield, Russell A	Russell A Merrifield v Northern New England
162	2015 C 04090	Michaud, Scott A	Scott A Michaud v Northern New England
163	2015 C 04040	Mitchell, Joshua P	Joshua P Mitchell v Northern New England
164	2015 C 04091	Moffatt, Jason	Jason Moffatt v Northern New England
165	2015 C 04207	Morin, Brian P	Brian P Morin v Northern New England
166	2015 C 04041	Morin, Stephen L	Stephen L Morin v Northern New England
167	2015 C 04092	Mulligan, Kevin P	Kevin P Mulligan v Northern New England
168	2015 C 04093	Newell, Edward F	Edward F Newell v Northern New England
169	2015 C 04043	Nostrom, Gary D	Gary D Nostrom v Northern New England
170	2015 C 04094	Obrien, Dennis L	Dennis L Obrien v Northern New England
171	2015 C 04044	O'brian, David C	David C O'brian v Northern New England
172	2015 C 04095	Ordway, Leon E	Leon E Ordway v Northern New England
173	2015 C 04045	Ouellette, Mark O	Mark O Ouellette v Northern New England
174	2015 C 04096	Palozzi, Michael J	Michael J Palozzi v Northern New England
175	2015 C 04046	Pellerin, Robert J	Robert J Pellerin v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
176	2015 C 04048	Perry, Paul E	Paul E Perry v Northern New England
177	2015 C 04097	Petell, Raymond A	Raymond A Petell v Northern New England
178	2015 C 04049	Pettengill, Lee H	Lee H Pettengill v Northern New England
179	2015 C 04050	Phillips, Anthony E	Anthony E Phillips v Northern New England
180	2015 C 04098	Plourde, Mark A	Mark A Plourde v Northern New England
181	2015 C 04099	Pooler, Richard D	Richard D Pooler v Northern New England
182	2015 C 04100	Poto, Michael	Michael Poto v Northern New England
183	2015 C 04101	Pratt, Daniel F	Daniel F Pratt v Northern New England
184	2015 C 04102	Ramsay, Thomas E	Thomas E Ramsay v Northern New England
185	2015 C 04103	Randall, Roberta J	Roberta J Randall v Northern New England
186	2015 C 04104	Randolph, Christopher C	Christopher C Randolph v Northern New England
187	2015 C 04105	Raynes, David L	David L Raynes v Northern New England
188	2015 C 04051	Raynes, Todd E	Todd E Raynes v Northern New England
189	2015 C 04052	Reynolds, Carol L	Carol L Reynolds v Northern New England
190	2015 C 04053	Rizza, Maria G	Maria G Rizza v Northern New England
191	2015 C 04054	Rogan, Michael J	Michael J Rogan v Northern New England
192	2015 C 04107	Rossignol, Norman R	Norman R Rossignol v Northern New England
193	2015 C 04108	Roy, Lori A	Lori A Roy v Northern New England
194	2015 C 04109	Roy, Marcel Y	Marcel Y Roy v Northern New England
195	2015 C 04110	Rugh, George J	George J Rugh v Northern New England
196	2015 C 04194	Sage, David	David Sage v Northern New England
197	2015 C 04111	Samiya, Howard	Howard Samiya v Northern New England
198	2015 C 04112	Sanborn, Amy L	Amy L Sanborn v Northern New England
199	2015 C 04055	Sands, James M	James M Sands v Northern New England
200	2015 C 04058	Scala, John L	John L Scala v Northern New England
201	2015 C 04113	Scala, Tracey L	Tracey L Scala v Northern New England
202	2015 C 04059	Shane, Patrick A	Patrick A Shane v Northern New England
203	2015 C 04060	Sherman, Cody A	Cody A Sherman v Northern New England
204	2015 C 04114	Sherman, Philip J	Philip J Sherman v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
205	2015 C 04061	Small, Mark	Mark Small v Northern New England
206	2015 C 04115	Smith, Adam L	Adam L Smith v Northern New England
207	2015 C 04116	Smith, Dirk A	Dirk A Smith v Northern New England
208	2015 C 04117	Smith, Mark A	Mark A Smith v Northern New England
209	2015 C 04119	Spaulding, Brent E	Brent E Spaulding v Northern New England
210	2015 C 04120	Stein-berthiaume, Angela M	Angela M Stein-berthiaume v Northern New England
211	2015 C 04062	Stewart, Scott H	Scott H Stewart v Northern New England
212	2015 C 04121	Sullivan, Brian E	Brian E Sullivan v Northern New England
213	2015 C 04063	Sullivan, Jamie	Jamie Sullivan v Northern New England
214	2015 C 04122	Tabun, Peter A	Peter A Tabun v Northern New England
215	2015 C 04123	Talbot, Timothy A	Timothy A Talbot v Northern New England
216	2015 C 04124	Tandy, Lorne E	Lorne E Tandy v Northern New England
217	2015 C 04064	Teehan, Mary A	Mary A Teehan v Northern New England
218	2015 C 04125	Therault, David R	David R Therault v Northern New England
219	2015 C 04065	Therault, Jessica L	Jessica L Therault v Northern New England
220	2015 C 04126	Thornton, Lynette B	Lynette B Thornton v Northern New England
221	2015 C 04066	Todd, James B	James B Todd v Northern New England
222	2015 C 04127	Townsend, Susan B	Susan B Townsend v Northern New England
223	2015 C 04128	Treadwell, Steven S	Steven S Treadwell v Northern New England
224	2015 C 04067	Turgeon, Scott A	Scott A Turgeon v Northern New England
225	2015 C 04129	Twitchell, Benjamin B	Benjamin B Twitchell v Northern New England
226	2015 C 04130	Umel, Benjamin K	Benjamin K Umel v Northern New England
227	2015 C 04068	Umel, Christino S	Christino S Umel v Northern New England
228	2015 C 04131	Van Tol, Alan	Alan Van Tol v Northern New England
229	2015-C 04069	Veregge, Steven P	Steven P Veregge v Northern New England
230	2015 C 04070	Violette, Eric	Eric Violette v Northern New England
231	2015 C 04132	Ward, Cynthia A	Cynthia A Ward v Northern New England
232	2015 C 04133	Watson, Robert J	Robert J Watson v Northern New England
233	2015 C 04134	Way, Amanda L	Amanda L Way v Northern New England

	A	B	C
2	Matter ID	Client Sort	Matter Description (First Line)
234	2015 C 04135	Webb, Santiba	Santiba Webb v Northern New England
235	2015 C 04071	Wentworth, Mark A	Mark A Wentworth v Northern New England
236	2015 C 04136	Whalen, James	James Whalen v Northern New England
237	2015 C 04137	Whidden, Christopher J	Christopher J Whidden v Northern New England
238	2015 C 04138	Whitcomb, Joshua L	Joshua L Whitcomb v Northern New England
239	2015 C 04139	White, Bryan	Bryan White v Northern New England
240	2015 C 04072	Whitney, Patrick C	Patrick C Whitney v Northern New England
241	2015 C 04140	Williams, Christina M	Christina M Williams v Northern New England
242	2015 C 04073	Williams, Steven C	Steven C Williams v Northern New England
243	2015 C 04074	Willwerth, William T	William T Willwerth v Northern New England
244	2015 C 04075	Wood, Nathaniel C	Nathaniel C Wood v Northern New England
245	2015 C 04141	Woodward, Carl C	Carl C Woodward v Northern New England
246	2015 C 04142	Worcester, Stephen D	Stephen D Worcester v Northern New England

<u>No.</u>	<u>Matter ID</u>	<u>Client Sort</u>	<u>Matter Description</u>
253	15-C-07444	Doherty, Andrea L.	Andrea L. Doherty v. FairPoint Logistics, Inc.
254	15-C-07223	Harman, Donna J.	Donna J. Harman v. FairPoint Logistics, Inc.
255	15-C-07445	Jeffers, Jenny L.	Jenny L. Jeffers v. FairPoint Logistics, Inc.

<u>No.</u>	<u>Matter ID</u>	<u>Client Sort</u>	<u>Matter Description</u>
247	15-C-07442	Austin, Kurt L.	Kurt L. Austin v. Northern New England
248	15-C-07443	Irish, Patrick	Patrick Irish v. Northern New England
249	15-C-07446	Rowe, Mark R.	Mark R. Rowe v. Northern New England
250	15-C-07408	Szylvian, Ann M.	Ann M. Szylvian v. Northern New England

Claimants Represented by Communications Workers of America,
Local 1400, and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 2327

v.

State of Maine Unemployment Insurance Commission

and

Fairpoint Logistics, Inc. and Northern New England Telephone
Operations LLC (d/b/a Fairpoint Communications-NNE)

Petitioners

Claimants

Roberta De Araujo, Esq.
Jeffrey Neil Young, Esq.
160 Capitol St., STE 3
Augusta, ME 04332

Respondents

State Insurance Commission

Nancy Macirowski, AAG
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Parties-in-Interest

Fairpoint Logistics

Catherine Connors, Esq.
254 Commercial Street
Portland, ME 04101

pro hac vice:

Arthur Telegen Esq.
Seaport East
2 SeaPort Lane, STE 300
Boston, MA 02210-2028
Augusta, ME 04333

