## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY	§	
Plaintiff,	§ §	
	§ §	
V.	§ §	
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF	§	Civil Action No.
SHEET METAL, AIR, RAIL AND	§	3:22-CV-00083-M
TRANSPORTATION WORKERS –	§	
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION and	§	
BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE	§	
ENGINEERS AND TRAINMEN,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

## PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Pursuant to Rule 65(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiff BNSF Railway Company ("BNSF") hereby move for a temporary restraining order against an imminent work stoppage threatened by International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail, and Transportation Workers — Transportation Division ("SMART-TD") and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen ("BLET") (collectively, "Defendants" or the "Unions"), in violation of Section 2 First, and Section 3 First, of the Railway Labor Act ("RLA"). 45 U.S.C. § 152 First, 45 U.S.C. § 153 First.

As explained in detail in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities and Appendix, Defendants are threatening to strike in response to BNSF's announcement of a modified attendance policy called "Hi Viz." This dispute, which is more fully described in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, arises from conflicting interpretations of the terms of the parties' collective bargaining agreements. The RLA requires that such disputes be resolved through binding arbitration. *See* 45

U.S.C. § 153 First. Because the present dispute is over the proper interpretation of the terms of the parties' collective bargaining agreements, Defendants' threatened strike is enjoinable as a violation of the RLA's minor dispute resolution process.

BNSF satisfies this Circuit's other standards for emergency injunctive relief. Defendants' threatened work stoppage will cause irreparable harm to BNSF by interfering with its operations and disrupting BNSF's ability to serve customers that depend on it to move goods in interstate commerce. Moreover, BNSF has no adequate remedy at law to address the harms that Defendants' threatened actions would inflict.

The public interest also supports an emergency injunction. Any work stoppage would be contrary to the interest of shippers and the public in uninterrupted rail operations. Indeed, a work stoppage, especially in current circumstances where the supply chain is already strained, could cause significant disruption in the delivery of critical supplies of fuel, food, mail, military equipment, and other vital materials. In contrast, if enjoined, Defendants will suffer no injury. Defendants will simply be forced to comply with the RLA's mandatory dispute resolution procedures. Furthermore, if Defendants' arguments in support of their interpretations of the parties' agreements ultimately prevail, they can be made whole through the RLA's dispute resolution procedures.

The Defendants' threatened use of self-help could begin at any time. The Unions have already publicly called for strike authorization votes, and BNSF has received indications that the Unions or their members may take action prior to the implementation of the Hi Viz policy on February 1, 2022, and potentially as soon as January 26, 2022.

Counsel for Defendants have been informed of this motion in an email today, January 18, 2022, and has been provided with copies of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, this motion, the

Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Temporary

Restraining Order and/or Preliminary Injunction, the Appendix, the Certificate of Compliance with

Rule 65(b), and the accompanying documents that have been concurrently filed with this Court.

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff BNSF respectfully requests that the Court enter an

order temporarily enjoining SMART-TD and BLET—as well as their officers, members,

employees, and others acting in concert with them—from calling, encouraging, or otherwise

engaging in a strike, picketing, a work stoppage, sick out, or slowdown, or otherwise exercising

coercive self-help against Plaintiff BNSF, its subsidiaries and/or affiliates, or encouraging others

to do so in violation of the RLA until a hearing can be held and a ruling issued on a motion for

preliminary injunction. A proposed order is attached.

Dated: January 18, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Russell D. Cawyer

David M. Pryor

Texas Bar No. 00791470

**BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY** 

2500 Lou Menk Drive, AOB-3

Fort Worth, Texas 76131-2828

Tel.: (817) 352-2286

Fax: (817) 352-2399

David.Pryor@BNSF.com

Donald J. Munro

D.C. Bar No. 453600

JONES DAY

51 Louisiana Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20001

Telephone: (202) 879-3939

Facsimile: (202) 626-1700

Email: dmunro@jonesday.com

Russell D. Cawyer State Bar No. 00793482 Taylor J. Winn State Bar No. 24115960 KELLY HART & HALLMAN LLP 201 Main Street, Suite 2500 Fort Worth, Texas 76102 Telephone: (817) 332-2500 Facsimile: (817) 335-2820 russell.cawyer@kellyhart.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY

taylor.winn@kellyhart.com

## **CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

On January 18, 2022, attorneys for Plaintiff conferred with Kevin C. Brodar and James Petroff, attorneys for Defendants, regarding the motion for a temporary restraining order filed today. An agreement could not be reached, as Plaintiff and Defendants disagree about whether Plaintiff may unilaterally implement the new attendance standards. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order is opposed.

/s/ Donald J. Munro
Donald J. Munro

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion, along with the supporting Memorandum and Proposed Order, were served upon counsel for Defendants (listed below) by electronic means on January 18, 2022.

Kevin C. Brodar Smart Transportation Division 24950 Country Club Blvd., Suite 340 North Olmsted, Ohio 44070 (216) 228-9400 kbrodar@smart-union.org

James Petroff Wentz, McInerney, Piefer & Petroff 3311 Bear Pointe Cir. Powell, Ohio 43065 (614) 756-5566 jpetroff@lawforlabor.com

/s/ Russell D. Cawyer
Russell D. Cawyer