In Scalia's Absence, Supreme Court Splits 4-4 in Decision on Union Dues

Overview of Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association

The Broader Issue

- The central issue is whether mandatory union fees for public-sector workers violate the first amendment
- While all public employees can opt out a union, in many states they are required to pay a portion of fees that is not allocated for political activity to the union; these charges are called "agency fees"
- Friedrichs and co. argue that all union fees are inherently political, and therefore compulsory agency fees violate free speech

Why does this matter?

- If the plaintiff succeeds, many public-sector unions could be crippled; agency fees are set in place to prevent non-members from "free riding" (reaping the benefits of unions with out paying dues) and without them even many who benefit from unions may decline to join
- In the long term, an adverse outcome for unions could weaken the bargaining power and political influence of unions, including the progressive initiatives that unions tend to support

How the Supreme Court Ruled

- With only eight people on the court after Scalia's passing, the court deadlocked in a 4-4 tie; a lower court ruling from 2014 stands, upholding California's right to compel non-union workers to pay fees
- Scalia was almost certainly going to rule against union fees; this ruling demonstrates a shift in the dynamics of the Court
- Without a Supreme Court ruling, mandatory union fees are subject to challenge once the Court has nine Justices again

Sources: Garrett Epps, "Will the U.S. Supreme Court Gut Public-Employee Unions," The Atlantic, January 12, 2016; Amy Howe, "Union Fees in Jeopardy: In Plain English," SCOTUS Blog, January 11, 2016; Cole Stangler, "Supreme Court Tackles Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association: What's At Stake For Public-Sector Unions And Workers?, IB Times, January 11, 2016; Lawrence Hurley, "U.S. Court Hands Win to Unions, Splits 4-4 Without Scalia," Reuters, March 30, 2016.