

NOT TO BE INCLUDED  
IN BOUND VOLUMES

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

GE APPLIANCES, A HAIER COMPANY

and

Case 09–CA–332521

LA DONNA S. DAWSON

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
AND TO REOPEN THE RECORD

The Charging Party’s motion for reconsideration of the Board’s Decision and Order reported at 374 NLRB No. 110 (2026), and to reopen the record, is denied.<sup>1</sup> The Charging Party has not identified any material error or demonstrated extraordinary circumstances warranting reconsideration under Section 102.48(c)(1) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations. Nor has the Charging Party identified any basis, under that same section, why the record should be reopened.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Charging Party titled her submission to the Board, “Supplemental Exception, Motion for reconsideration, and Request to reopen the record.” To the extent the Charging Party advances arguments that she failed to assert before the judge or the Board on exceptions, including those related to the judge’s factual findings and credibility determinations and the introduction of supplemental payroll and banking documents, these arguments are waived and therefore do not serve as a basis for granting reconsideration or reopening the record under Sec. 102.48(c)(1) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations. See Sec. 102.46(a)(1)(ii) and (f); see also *H&M Int’l Transportation*, 363 NLRB 1861, 1861 (2016) (deeming issues not previously urged to have been waived).

<sup>2</sup> The Charging Party requests that the Board reopen the record to receive additional evidence, including “Payroll election records,” “Payroll transactions history,” “Banking correspondence an [sic] account documentation,” and “Evidence concerning inaccessible or charged-off bank accounts.” The Charging Party does not explain why

Dated, Washington, D.C., July 1, 2026

---

James R. Murphy, Chairman

---

David M. Prouty, Member

---

Scott A. Mayer, Member

(SEAL)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

---

the evidence sought to be adduced “was not presented previously, and that, if adduced and credited, it would require a different result,” as required under Sec. 102.48(c)(1) of the Board’s Rules. Indeed, the Charging Party does not articulate how the additional documents sought to be introduced relate to whether the General Counsel met her burden to show that the Respondent violated the Act. Accordingly, the Charging Party has not established a basis for reopening the record.