

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.

**Siren Retail Corporation d/b/a Starbucks and Workers United, affiliated with Service Employees International Union.** Case 19–CA–299478

March 23, 2026

SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION AND ORDER

BY MEMBERS PROUTY, MURPHY, AND MAYER

On November 30, 2022, the National Labor Relations Board issued a decision in this case, finding that the Respondent violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the National Labor Relations Act by failing and refusing to bargain with Workers United, affiliated with Service Employees International Union (the Union) and, accordingly, ordering the Respondent to bargain with the Union on request.<sup>1</sup> At that time, the Board severed and retained the issue of whether the Board should grant the General Counsel’s request for the Board to overrule *Ex-Cell-O Corp.*, 185 NLRB 107 (1970), and adopt a remedy that would require employers to compensate employees “for the lost opportunity to engage in collective bargaining at the time and in

the manner contemplated by the Act” in test-of-certification cases.

On February 26, 2026, the Board issued its decision in *Longmont United Hospital*, 374 NLRB No. 52, declining to depart from its longstanding remedial practices where an employer has defended its refusal to bargain on grounds that it is challenging the union’s certification.<sup>2</sup> Consistent with that decision, we decline to order the additional remedy requested.<sup>3</sup>

Dated, Washington, D.C. March 23, 2026

---

David M. Prouty, Member

---

James R. Murphy, Member

---

Scott A. Mayer, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

---

<sup>1</sup> *Siren Retail Corp. d/b/a Starbucks*, 372 NLRB No. 10 (2022), enfd. 99 F.4th 1118 (9th Cir. 2024).

<sup>2</sup> In light of this decision, we deny as moot the General Counsel’s February 27, 2026 motion to withdraw the request that the Board overrule *Ex-Cell-O Corp.*

<sup>3</sup> For the reasons stated in his dissent in *Longmont United Hospital*, supra, and in order to effectuate Sec. 10(c) of the Act, Member Prouty

would overrule *Ex-Cell-O Corp.* and impose the additional remedies outlined in his dissent, including ordering the employer to make affected employees whole for any provable, reasonably quantifiable economic harm resulting from the employer’s unlawful refusal to bargain. See *Longmont*, supra, slip op. at 2–5 (Member Prouty, dissenting).