

 KeyCite Yellow Flag - Negative Treatment
Affirmed by an Equally Divided Court [Friedrichs v. California Teachers Ass'n](#), U.S., March 29, 2016

2014 WL 10076847

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
United States Court of Appeals,
Ninth Circuit.

Rebecca FRIEDRICHES; et al.,
Plaintiffs–Appellants,

v.

CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION; et al.,
Defendants–Appellees,
Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General,
Defendant–Intervenor.

No. 13–57095.

|

Nov. 18, 2014.

Attorneys and Law Firms

James Burnham, Jones Day, Chicago, IL, Michael Anthony Carvin, Jones Day, Michael Rosman, General Counsel, Washington, DC, Edward San Chang, Esquire, John A. Vogt, Trial, Jones Day, Irvine, CA, for Plaintiff–Appellant.

Jeffrey B. Demain, Esquire, Altshuler Berzon, LLP, San Francisco, CA, Laura P. Juran, Jacob F. Rukeyser, Esquire, California Teachers Association, Burlingame, CA, Jason Walta, National Education Association Office of General Counsel, Jeremiah A. Collins, Esquire, Bredhoff & Kaiser, PLLC, Washington, DC, Marlon Craig Wadlington, Esquire, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Cerritos, CA, Jeffrey P. Thompson, Esquire, Declues, Burkett & Thompson, LLP, Huntington Beach, CA, Kerrie E. McNally, Fagen Friedman & Fulfrost, LLP, Henry Chi-Jen Wang, Esquire, Lee Tran & Liang, LLP, Los Angeles, CA, Michael Eric Hersher,

End of Document

Esquire, Deputy General Counsel, Young, Minney & Corr, LLP, Sacramento, CA, for Defendant–Appellee.

D.C. No. 8:13-cv-00676-JLS-CW, Central District of California, Santa Ana.

Before [CANBY](#), [CLIFTON](#), and [OWENS](#), Circuit Judges.

ORDER

*1 The court has reviewed appellants' motion for summary affirmance and appellees' opposition thereto, the record, and the briefing filed in this appeal. Upon review, the court finds that the questions presented in this appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument, because they are governed by controlling Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit precedent. See [United States v. Hooton](#), 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir.1982) (per curiam) (stating standard for summary affirmance); [Abood v. Detroit Bd. Of Ed.](#), 431 U.S. 209, 232 (1977) (allowing public-sector agency shop); [Mitchell v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.](#), 963 F.2d 258, 263 (9th Cir.1992) (allowing opt-out regime).

Accordingly, we summarily affirm the district court's judgment.

AFFIRMED.

All Citations

Not Reported in F.3d, 2014 WL 10076847

© 2016 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.