

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- I. WHETHER THE COURT OF APPEALS CORRECTLY HELD THAT A MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL PLAYER'S CLAIMS UNDER MINNESOTA'S DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING IN THE WORKPLACE ACT CHALLENGING A SUSPENSION UNDER A COLLECTIVELY BARGAINED FOR DRUG POLICY ARE NOT PREEMPTED BY SECTION 301 OF THE LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT.

- II. WHETHER THE COURT OF APPEALS WAS CORRECT IN SETTING ASIDE AN ARBITRATOR'S AWARD SANCTIONING MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL'S REFUSAL TO ISSUE WARNINGS REGARDING THE PRESENCE OF A BANNED SUBSTANCE IN SPECIFIC PRODUCTS BECAUSE SUCH AN AWARD WAS IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY.

Table of Contents

	<u>page</u>
Question Presented.....	i
Table of Contents	ii
Table of Authorities	iii
Statement of Jurisdiction.....	1
Standard of Review.....	1
Opinions.....	1
Statutory Provisions	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Facts.....	2
Statement of the Case.....	5
Summary of the Argument.....	6
Argument	8
I. As the Drug and Alcohol Testing in the Workplace Act requires that drug testing policies meet its minimum standards, claims brought under the Act must be preempted under Section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act and therefore this Court should find that MLB is entitled to summary judgment on the claims	8
a. Applicable Principles	8
b. The language of Minnesota’s Drug and Alcohol Testing in the Workplace Act requires interpretation of the collective bargaining agreement between Major League Baseball and the Major League Baseball Players Association.....	10
c. The need for uniform interpretation of Major League Baseball’s collective bargaining agreement requires preemption under Section 301.....	13
II. The arbitrator’s decision upholding plaintiff’s suspension was not in violation of public policy because the MLB did not owe the players a fiduciary to issue product specific warnings concerning the presence of banned substances.....	15
Conclusion	20

Table of Authorities

	<u>page</u>
United States Supreme Court Cases	
<i>Allis-Chalmers Corporation v. Lueck</i> , 471 U.S. 202 (1985)	9, 10, 11, 13
<i>Eastern Assoc. Coal Cos. V. United Mine Workers of Am.</i> , 531 U.S. 57, 62 (2000)	17
<i>Healy v. Beer Institute, Inc.</i> , 491 U.S. 324 (1989).....	14
<i>Lingle v. Norge Division of Magic Chef, Inc.</i> , 486 U.S. 399 (1988)	14,
<i>Teamsters v. Lucas Flour, Co.</i> , 369 U.S. 95 (1962)	8, 14, 15
<i>Textile Workers v. Lincoln Mills</i> , 353 U.S. 448 (1957)	8
<i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Local Union 759</i> , 461 U.S. 757, 766 (1983)	17, 20
United States Court of Appeals Cases	
<i>Bogan v. General Motors Corp.</i> , 500 F.3d 828 (8th Cir. 2007)	10, 11
<i>Coca-Cola Bottling Co of St. Louis v. Teamsters Local Union No. 688</i> , 959 F.2d 1438 (1992) ..	16
<i>Cramer v. Consolidated Freightways, Inc.</i> , 255 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2001).....	10
<i>Crawford Group, Inc. v. Holekamp</i> , 543 F.3d 971 (8th Cir. 2008)	16
<i>Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. Air Line Pilots Ass’n, Int’l</i> , 861 F.2d 665 (11 th Cir. 1998).....	20
<i>Karnes v. Boeing Co.</i> , 335 F.3d 1189 (10th Cir. 2003)	12, 13
<i>MidAm. Energy Co. v. Int’l Bd. of Elec. Workers Local 499</i> , 345 F.3d 616 (8th Cir. 2003)	17
<i>Stark v. Sandburg, Phoenix & Von Gontard, P.C.</i> , 381 F.3d 793 (8th Cir. 2004)	16,
<i>Trs. of the Twin City Bricklayers Fringe Benefit Funds v. Superior Waterproofing, Inc.</i> , 450 F.3d 324 (8th Cir. 2006).....	10, 14, 15
United States District Court Cases	
<i>Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co. v. Franey Muha Alliant Ins. Servs.</i> , 388 F.Supp.2d 292 (S.D.N.Y. 2002)	17
<i>Thompson v. Hibbing Taconite Holding Co.</i> , No. 08-868, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87045 (D. Minn. 2008).....	12, 13
Statutes	
9 U.S.C. § 10 (2006)	16
28 U.S.C. § 1254 (2006)	1
29 U.S.C. § 185 (2006)	1, 8
Minn. Stat. § 151.04 (2009)	9
Minn. Stat. § 152.02 (2009)	9
Minn. Stat. § 181.950 (2009)	9
Minn. Stat. § 181.951(2009)	9
Minn. Stat. § 181.952 (2009)	9
Minn. Stat. § 181.955 (2009)	9, 10, 11, 13