

**Vaccine Mandate – issues list 9-20-2021**

The implementation of a vaccine mandate needs to be discussed with unions. Below is a list of possible issues to be discussed in addition to being disciplined for insubordination.

1. Discipline and job security.
2. Safety.
3. PPE & testing as condition of employment.
4. Health benefits.
5. Costs of vaccination.
6. Leave for obtaining vaccination.
7. Leave for side-effects of vaccination.
8. Costs of testing the unvaccinated.
9. Frequency of testing the unvaccinated.
10. Medical privacy issues, both as to vaccination verification and testing for the unvaccinated.
11. Procedures for “proof” of vaccination.
12. Procedures for testing the unvaccinated.
13. Incentives to get vaccinated.
14. Scheduling impacts on staffing and safety.
15. Working conditions for the unvaccinated.

Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Policy

For the health and wellness of its workforce, those entering its workplaces, and the communities in which it operates, Rose Companies Employer (“Rose Companies”) is requiring all employees become fully vaccinated against COVID-19, unless otherwise prohibited by law.

Deadlines

To be considered fully vaccinated against COVID-19, employees must be two weeks removed from the first and only required Johnson & Johnson/Janssen shot or two weeks removed from the second shot of the two shot regimen required for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine or Moderna vaccine.

Rose Companies is requiring all employees receive at least the Johnson & Johnson/Janssen vaccine or the first shot of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine or the Moderna vaccine no later than

_____.

Employees must be fully vaccinated no later than _____.

If you are interested in learning about the differences in the vaccines available, please visit the website for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”) at:

<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/different-vaccines.html>.

Proof of Vaccination

Employees must provide proof of vaccination by the deadlines listed above. To do this, employees must upload a copy of their “COVID-19 Vaccination Record Card” to _____. The COVID-19 Vaccination Record Card is double-sided and slightly larger than a traditional business card. It has the CDC logo on the top right-hand corner of the front of the card and was provided by the entity that administered the vaccine.

Please note that if you have only received one Pfizer-BioNTech shot or Moderna shot by the initial deadline, you will need to upload your COVID-19 Vaccination Record Card twice – once after your first shot and before the initial deadline and once after your second shot and before the deadline to be fully vaccinated.

For those employees who are already fully vaccinated, please upload your card as soon as possible and no later than **[insert some time prior to the first deadline so you are not inundated with cards]**.

Finding the Vaccine

COVID-19 vaccines are readily available at multiple locations. If you need help locating a vaccine, please visit the CDC’s website at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/How-Do-I-Get-a-COVID-19-Vaccine.html>.

COVID-19 vaccines are free. Additionally, the company pays for [insert – time it takes to get shot, recovery, etc.].

Benefits of Getting Vaccinated

There are numerous benefits to getting vaccinated many of which the CDC outlined at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/vaccine-benefits.html>.

Reasonable Accommodations

Employees who need an exemption from this mandatory vaccination requirement due to a medical reason/disability or sincerely held religious belief must contact [redacted] at [redacted]. Employees must do this no later than [insert date approximately two weeks prior to the first deadline, so as to give Talent & Culture time to work through the requests]. Talent & Culture will initiate the accommodation process, including any required paperwork. Employees should only contact [redacted] with these requests and should not address these requests with other members of Talent & Culture or their supervisors.

Those who are unable to get vaccinated may be subject to testing or additional requirements.

Failure to Provide Proof of Vaccination

Employees who fail to provide proof of vaccination and who do not obtain an exemption from getting vaccinated will be discharged.

Questions

Please direct any questions you may have regarding this policy to Human Resources and specifically [redacted], who can be reached at [redacted].

COVID-19 ATTESTATION
Sincerely Held Religious Belief, Practice, or Observance

I have a sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance that prevents me from getting any of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines, which include the Johnson & Johnson/Janssen vaccine, the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, and the Moderna vaccine.

My religion or religious belief system is: _____
_____.

My sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance conflicts with the company's mandatory COVID-19 vaccination policy as follows:

_____.

My sincerely held religious belief, practice, or observance that prevents me from getting a COVID-19 vaccine is more than a personal belief that is essentially political, sociological, or philosophical.

I attest that the above statements are true and accurate. I understand that falsification or misrepresentation may result in disciplinary action, up to and including immediate termination of my employment.

Employee Signature

Date

Employee Printed Name

*****Please scan and email this completed form to
confidential tracking.**

for consideration and

Date request received: / / .

Received by: _____.

This form contains confidential information
and must be kept separate from other
human resource records

Medical Information Request and Verification for Employee Requesting Accommodation

Date: _____	Name: _____
Employee ID#: _____	Home Address: _____
Daytime telephone number: () - _____	City/State/Zip: _____
<p>I authorize the [Rose Companies Employer] Talent & Culture department to communicate both verbally and in writing, if necessary, with the appropriate health care or rehabilitation professionals with regard to the resolution of my request for a disability accommodation. My signature indicates that I am aware of the nature of the information being disclosed and with whom it will be shared.</p>	
Your Signature: _____	Date: _____

To Be Completed By Physician or Appropriate Medical Professional

Name of certifying professional: _____ Title: _____
(Please Print)

Certification or License# _____ Tele # _____

Business Address: _____
(Number & Street)

(City) (State) (Zip)

(Signature of Physician/Medical Professional)

(Date)

Content of this request is confidential and will not be shared by any employee of the [Rose Companies Employer] Talent & Culture department except to consider the implementation of the disability accommodation.

MEDICAL INQUIRY FORM IN RESPONSE TO AN ACCOMMODATION REQUEST

A. Questions to help determine whether an employee has a disability

For reasonable accommodation under the ADA, an employee has a disability if the employee has an impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities or a record of such an impairment. The following questions may help determine whether an employee has a disability:

Does the employee have a physical or mental impairment that prevents the employee from getting one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines (i.e., Johnson & Johnson/Janssen vaccine, the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, and the Moderna vaccine)?

Yes No

If *yes*, what is the impairment that prevents the employee from getting one of the available vaccines?

Is the impairment long-term or permanent?

Yes No

If *not* permanent, how long will the impairment last?

Is there anything the employee could do to eliminate or remove the impairment so as to allow the employee to get one of the available vaccines?

Yes No

If *yes*, what could the employee do to eliminate or remove the impairment so as to allow the employee to get one of the available vaccines?

Answer the following questions based on what limitations the employee has when the condition is in an active state and what limitations the employee would have if no mitigating measures were used. Mitigating measures include things such as medication, medical supplies, equipment, hearing aids, mobility devices, the use of assistive technology, reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids or services, prosthetics, and learned behavioral or adaptive neurological modifications. Mitigating measures do not include ordinary eyeglasses or contact lenses.

Does the impairment identified above substantially limit a major life activity?

Yes No

Note: Does not need to significantly or severely restrict to meet this standard.

If *yes*, what major life activity(s) is/are affected?

- | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caring for Self | <input type="checkbox"/> Walking | <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Lifting | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interacting With Others | <input type="checkbox"/> Standing | <input type="checkbox"/> Seeing | <input type="checkbox"/> Sleeping | <input type="checkbox"/> Sitting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performing Manual Tasks | <input type="checkbox"/> Reaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Concentrating | <input type="checkbox"/> Breathing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Thinking | <input type="checkbox"/> Learning | <input type="checkbox"/> Working | <input type="checkbox"/> Reproduction | <input type="checkbox"/> Toileting |

Does the impairment identified above substantially limit the operation of a major bodily function?

Yes No

Note: Does not need to significantly or severely restrict to meet this standard (circle your response).

If yes, what bodily function is affected?

- | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Immune | <input type="checkbox"/> Hemic | <input type="checkbox"/> Circulatory | <input type="checkbox"/> Normal Cell Growth | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Sense
Organs and Skin | <input type="checkbox"/> Endocrine | <input type="checkbox"/> Digestive | <input type="checkbox"/> Lymphatic | <input type="checkbox"/> Cardiovascular |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reproductive | <input type="checkbox"/> Bowel | <input type="checkbox"/> Neurological | <input type="checkbox"/> Musculoskeletal | <input type="checkbox"/> Genitourinary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bladder | <input type="checkbox"/> Brain | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Sense | <input type="checkbox"/> Respiratory | |

Please provide specific restrictions for each box checked above:

B. Comments – please provide any related comments in the following box.

If required, please use additional sheets for any of the information requested above.

(Signature of Physician/Medical Professional)

(Date)

The Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 (GINA) prohibits employers and other entities covered by GINA Title II from requesting or requiring genetic information of an individual or family member of the individual, except as specifically allowed by this law. To comply with this law, we are asking that you not provide any genetic information when responding to this request for medical information. "Genetic information" as defined by GINA includes an individual's family medical history, the results of an individual's or family member's genetic tests, the fact that an individual or an individual's family member sought or received genetic services, and genetic information of a fetus carried by an individual or an individual's family member or an embryo lawfully held by an individual or family member receiving assistive reproductive services.

*****Please scan and email this completed form to talentculture@rosecompanies.com for consideration and confidential tracking.**

DISCRIMINATION—RELIGIOUS—D.R.I.: Healthcare workers fail to obtain TRO against state COVID-19 vaccine regulation

By Brandi O. Brown, J.D.

A court denied the temporary restraining order sought by the healthcare workers, who claimed the vaccine mandate violated federal law.

A federal district court in Rhode Island denied the request for a TRO filed by a group of healthcare workers who sought injunctive relief after the state promulgated an emergency regulation requiring healthcare workers to be vaccinated against COVID-19 by October 1, 2021. They claimed that the regulation violated the U.S. Constitution and Title VII because it did not allow the workers to obtain a religious exemption. The court found that they did not demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits of those claims. In particular, the court noted that employers may still be able to provide religious accommodation (*Dr. T v. Alexander-Scott*, September 30, 2021, McElroy, M.).

New COVID-19 regulation. On August 17, 2021, the Rhode Island Department of Health promulgated a regulation requiring all healthcare workers, except those who met a very narrow medical exemption, to be vaccinated against COVID-19 by October 1. According to the workers, the regulation did not include an opportunity for a worker to obtain a religious exemption and therefore violated the U.S. Constitution and Title VII.

Healthcare workers seek relief. They sought a temporary restraining order and asked the court to enjoin the health department from enforcing any requirement that employers deny religious exemptions or that they revoke any exemptions already granted before the regulation was promulgated. They also sought to enjoin the department from interfering with the granting of religious exemptions going forward and from taking any disciplinary action against them. They also asked that the court, if it were to deny their request for a TRO, to issue an order denying a preliminary injunction.

Likelihood of success? Concluding that the state defendants would be unduly prejudiced if not allowed an opportunity to develop a factual record before consideration of a preliminary injunction, the court focused solely on the request for a temporary restraining order. In deciding whether to grant a TRO, the court noted, it had to consider four factors: (1) the likelihood of the healthcare workers' success on the merits; (2) the potential for irreparable harm if relief was denied; (3) the balance of hardships; and (4) the effect of the court's ruling on the public interest. If the first factor is not established, the court noted, the other prongs become irrelevant and the healthcare workers bear the burden of demonstrating that the factors weighed in their favor.

Not on Supremacy Clause claim. In this case, the court concluded, the workers did not meet their burden. Regarding the constitutional claims made by the workers, the court noted that it has long been held that mandatory vaccination laws are a valid exercise of a state's police powers. As a result, those laws have withstood constitutional challenge.

Supreme Court has held that reading a private right of action into the Supremacy Clause would be “strange.”

Not preempted. The next question, however, was whether the state regulation was preempted by Title VII. Again, observed the court, the U.S. Supreme Court has weighed in on this issue, emphasizing that there is a strong presumption that state regulation of health and safety matters are not invalidated under the clause. The court explained, “Federal preemption of a state health and safety regulation will be found only in situations where it is ‘the clear and manifest purpose of Congress.’”

May still be able to accommodate. Preemption can either be done by an express provision of statute or through conflict preemption. Title VII did not expressly preempt state public-health regulations, which the healthcare workers conceded. Instead, they argued that the regulation interferes with their rights under Title VII, contending that it “outright forbids” them from seeking or retaining reasonable accommodations according with their sincerely held religious beliefs. However, the court explained, this was not an accurate reading of the regulation’s text. Nothing in the language of the regulation prevents an employer from providing such an accommodation—rather, the regulation is silent on the issue.

While the regulation may make it more difficult for employers to accommodate religious objections, the court observed, that does not create a “physical impossibility.” There was no likelihood of the workers’ success on the merits of their claim that the regulation makes reasonable accommodation virtually impossible. Thus, they failed to make out a case of likelihood of success on the merits of their Title VII claim and the court denied the TRO.

The case is [No. 1:21-cv-00387-MSM-LDA](#).

Attorneys: Joseph S. Larisa, Jr. (Larisa Law) for Dr. T., Nurse L., Hosp Clerk M. and Health Unit Coordinator L. Bruce D. Todesco, RI Office of the Mental Health Advocate and Michael W. Field, Office of the Attorney General, for Nicole Scott Alexander and Daniel J. McKee.

Cases: ReligiousDiscrimination IndividualRights StateLawClaims RemediesDamages
Discrimination Covid19 Procedure RhodelslandNews

[Back to Top ^](#)

N.J. Super. App. Div.: City of Newark has a managerial prerogative to implement COVID-19 vaccination mandate

By Kathleen Kapusta, J.D.

“The Unions have not cited any facts that would support the purported rights of what appears to be a minority of City employees to pose a risk to coworkers and City residents.”

The City of Newark, New Jersey, has a nonnegotiable managerial prerogative to immediately implement its COVID-19 vaccination mandate, a state appeals court ruled, affirming in part a Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC) order. Vacating the order in part, the court found the restraints PERC placed on the city, including that it negotiate its ability to enforce and set deadlines for vaccination, impermissibly interfered with the city’s managerial prerogative to protect the health and safety of its employees and residents (*In the Matter of City of Newark*, September 27, 2021, Gilson, R.).

Executive Order. On August 10, 2021, the Newark mayor, after consulting all city department heads, issued an Executive Order mandating that all city employees “be fully vaccinated against COVID-19” by August 16. The EO also required employees to provide proof of vaccination. Those employees who were not fully vaccinated had to provide proof of initial vaccination and proof of full vaccination within 30 days. In the interim, they had to be tested weekly at their expense. Noncompliant employees would be subject to discipline, including termination. The order allowed exceptions for religious and medical reasons.

Union opposition. On August 12, a police union, seeking injunctive relief, filed unfair labor practice charges against the city with PERC. The following day, the PERC director temporarily enjoined implementation of the EO. Shortly thereafter, eight other unions representing city employees also filed unfair labor practice charges and also sought to enjoin implementation of the vaccine mandate.

PERC order. The PERC director consolidated the matters and after a hearing issued an order holding that the city’s vaccination mandate was “an exercise of the City’s managerial prerogative.” The director, however, also found the mandate impacted “negotiable terms and conditions of employment that are severable from the mandate, including discipline, allotted time periods, costs and locations for COVID-19 testing, privacy concerning or related to testing and vaccines and allotted periods for receiving vaccinations.”

Negotiate. Further, the director found the relative hardships of the parties tipped in favor of the unions and the public interest and ordered the city to “expeditiously negotiate in good faith upon demand all mandatorily negotiable impacts of its prerogative to mandate full vaccinations against COVID-19 as set forth in [the Executive Order].” The city and six unions filed for emergent relief.

City’s authority. Addressing first whether the city had the authority to issue the vaccine mandate, the court noted that in issuing the EO, the mayor relied on the public health emergency created by COVID-19 and his authority to supervise all city departments and employees. As the city’s chief executive officer, a mayor has the authority to establish policies governing city employees, the court noted, and in public employment, “that authority is well established under the concept of managerial prerogative.”

Not acting in a vacuum. Further, said the court, during a public health emergency, governmental authorities “have a recognized right to require vaccinations.” While the unions

argued that there was no express statutory authority for the vaccination mandate, the court found that the mayor, in issuing the mandate, was not acting in a vacuum. Rather, the President of the United States declared a national emergency concerning the COVID-19 outbreak and New Jersey's governor also declared a public health emergency and state of emergency due to COVID-19.

Consistent with those declarations, the president directed all federal workers and workers for federal contractors be vaccinated or comply with testing requirements and the governor announced that all state employees would be required to be vaccinated or tested. "Moreover, other federal agencies, state officials, cities, and municipalities have also issued similar COVID-19 vaccination requirements."

Right to direct workforce. The court also noted the city's right to hire and direct its workforce, which, coupled with the public policy to combat the health threats posed by COVID-19, supported its authority to implement a vaccination mandate. Further, in confronting the ongoing challenges of the pandemic, "municipalities remain 'the broad repository of local police power.'" Accordingly, said the court, Newark has a managerial prerogative to implement its vaccination mandate."

Negotiating impact of prerogative. Turning to the unions' assertion the city was required pursuant to the New Jersey Employer-Employee Relations Act to negotiate the mandate before implementing it, the court found the unions did not cite to anything in their contracts that prohibited the city from issuing a mandate "under these extraordinary circumstances." Instead, the unions argued that public employers have a duty to negotiate procedures for implementing prerogatives.

For its part, the city argued that its contracts with the unions reserved the right to hire employees and determine their qualifications for continued employment. While this language, said the court did not expressly authorize the city to impose a vaccination mandate, it supported its authority to impose a mandatory vaccination requirement in a public health emergency.

Policy setting ability. Moreover, the court observed, it is well-established that negotiations of managerial prerogatives are not required if those negotiations significantly interfere with a public employer's ability to set policy. "In the context of a public health emergency, negotiating procedures for the implementation of a COVID-19 vaccination mandate, or the enforcement or timing of the mandate, would interfere with the managerial prerogative." And delaying the timelines for implementing the mandate, even temporarily, undercuts the mandate's effectiveness, the court explained.

Right to protect the public. And while the unions pointed to the mandate's impact on their members who have chosen not to be vaccinated, not only did this ignore the impact of this choice on the vaccinated coworkers, it also ignored the impact on people with whom the unvaccinated employees come into contact, including children who do not yet have the option of getting vaccinated. "Given the scientifically undisputed risk of spreading this deadly virus," the court wrote, "the City has the right to protect the public."

Non-negotiable. Requiring the city to negotiate over disciplining noncompliant employees would also undercut the mandate's effectiveness, said the court, noting that a public employer has the prerogative to determine the basis for discipline. Thus, the court found that in a COVID-19 pandemic, the impacts of the city's vaccination mandate on its employee are non-negotiable.

Common good. Noting that sometimes “the protection of the many requires an individual, especially a public servant, to act for the public good,” the court found the union failed to cite to any facts in support of the purported rights of what appeared to be a minority of city employees to pose a risk to their coworkers and city residents. There is no constitutional or statutory right to a government job, the court observed, and thus “City employees have the right to get vaccinated and keep their jobs or decide that they do not want to work for the common good.”

Injunctive relief. As to the preliminary injunctive relief ordered by PERC, the court found the unions failed to show a likelihood of success on the merits, that on balance the harm to the moving party is greater than the harm to the party to be restrained, and the public interest would not be harmed. Accordingly, the court affirmed PERC’s holding that the city has a managerial prerogative to implement the vaccine mandate and vacated all restraints imposed by PERC.

The case is Nos. A-0146-21 and A-0159-21.

Attorneys: Matthew J. Giacobbe (Cleary Giacobbe Alfieri Jacobs) for City of Newark. Craig S. Gumpel (Law offices of Craig S. Gumpel) for Newark Firefighters Union and Newark Police Superior Officers' Association. Kevin P. McGovern (Mets Schiro & McGovern) for Teamsters Local 97. Raymond G. Heineman, Jr. (Kroll, Heineman, Ptasiewicz & Parsons) for JNESO District Council 1, IUOE. Christine Lucarelli for Public Employment Relations Commission. Paul L. Kleinbaum (Zazzali Fagella Nowak Kleinbaum & Friedman) for AFSCME New Jersey Council 63, Locals 2297, 2298, 2299 and IAFF Local 1860. Matthew D. Areman (Markowitz & Richman) for Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 12. Daniel J. Zirrieth (Law Offices of Daniel J. Zirrieth) for Newark Council No. 21 IFPTE.

EMPLOYEE LEAVE—D.P.R.: Employee’s EPSLA, EFMLEA claims collapse due to failure to request leave, ability to telework

By Tulay Turan, J.D.

The employee did not request leave and did not provide a statement that she was unable to work because of a qualified reason for leave.

An administrative assistant, who requested a hybrid work arrangement instead of paid leave, could not proceed with her claims under the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA), ruled a federal district court in Puerto Rico. In addition to failing to request leave, she did not qualify for it where she could continue to telework while her son’s school was closed. The court also declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her state law claims, dismissing them without prejudice (*Collazo v. Ferrovial Construcción PR. LLC*, September 30, 2021, Dominguez, D.).

The former employee, who had a nine-year-old son in fourth grade, worked as an administrative assistant. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, her son’s school established a remote school program that ran Mondays through Thursdays from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. On August 31, 2020, the employee sent an email to her employer indicating she could work in the office on Tuesdays and Fridays and remotely on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays due to her son’s schedule.

Allowed to work remotely. Although the employer provided the employee with notice of the enactment of the FFCRA, which includes the Emergency Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act (EFMLEA) and the Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act (EPSLA), she did not request paid leave pursuant to those acts, but rather chose to request a work arrangement that would allow her to work some days in the office and others remotely. The employer granted her request by allowing her to work part of her daily schedule remotely for three days a week. Nevertheless, the employer terminated her on September 11, 2020, without providing grounds for termination.

The employee filed a complaint alleging violations of the FLSA, FMLA, FFCRA, EFMLEA and EPSLA. She also filed claims under Puerto Rico law for wrongful and retaliatory termination. The employer filed this motion to dismiss.

Leave under EPSLA, EFMLEA. EPSLA entitled certain employees to take up to two weeks of paid sick leave for specific qualifying reasons, including to care for a son or daughter if his or her school had been closed. The EFMLEA temporarily expanded the applicability of the FMLA to certain employees for up to 12 weeks of paid leave per year “because of a qualifying need related to a public emergency.” To qualify for these leaves, both the EPSLA and the EFMLEA required the employee to be unable to work or telework in order to tend to a child whose school is closed due to a public emergency in relation to the pandemic.

Failed to request leave. The court found the employee’s EPSLA and EFMLEA claims failed as a matter of law because she merely requested a hybrid work accommodation; she did not request paid leave pursuant to the federal legislation. She provided her name and a request for a hybrid work accommodation. No request for leave was made, and no statement was provided that she was unable to work because of a qualified reason for leave. There was no allegation she requested leave and that the employer refused to provide it. She ultimately failed to request or take any leave pursuant to the applicable statutes and, therefore, did not qualify for paid leave provided that she could continue to work or telework while taking care of her son.

No individual liability. The court also found the employee's allegations as to individual liability were insufficient. The allegations only described or referred to the defendants and did not provide a sufficient basis for a plausible claim for relief against them. Moreover, given the fact that the employee failed to request to take any leave pursuant to the applicable federal statutes, her federal claims failed as a matter of law and the issue of individual liability was moot.

Supplemental jurisdiction rejected. Lastly, because all federal claims were being properly dismissed well before the commencement of trial, the court rejected exercising supplemental jurisdiction over the Puerto Rico law claims. Thus, the court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss the federal claims with prejudice and the state law claims without prejudice.

The case is [No. 20-1612 \(DRD\)](#).

Attorneys: Enrique J. Mendoza-Mendez (Mendoza Law Office) for Yaritzianne Figueroa-Collazo. Anabel Rodriguez-Alonso (Schuster Aguilo) for Ferrovial Construcción PR, LLC.

Companies: Ferrovial Construcción PR, LLC

Cases: EmployeeLeave Retaliation StateLawClaims Covid19 PuertoRicoNews GCNNews

[Back to Top ^](#)