EXECUTIVE ORDERS MARK A RISING, ROILING TIDE OF IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

by Christopher L. Thomas (Denver) and Lowell Sachs (Raleigh)

In his first week in office, President Donald Trump launched a series of executive orders (EO) directing large-scale changes on high-profile immigration issues. The EOs echo the themes of beefing up border security, cracking down on undocumented immigration, escalating deportations, emphasizing national security objectives, and increasing worksite enforcement. So far, the direct impact of these EOs on employers has been fairly limited, but that status could change with the anticipated issuance of further EOs in the days ahead. Given the highly-charged and deeply polarizing nature of immigration issues in the United States, the EOs so far have been met by strong reactions across the country.

The following is a guide to the immigration-related EOs President Trump has issued so far, along with a brief look at several additional draft EOs that are anticipated, but that have not yet been issued.


The primary purpose of this EO, as reflected in its policy statement, is to spur “the immediate construction of a physical wall on the southern border.” Although the EO calls for U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary John Kelly to take on the immediate planning, design, and construction of a physical wall, details concerning the exact nature of the wall as well as the source of its funding are left open. Instead, the EO simply directs the Secretary to allocate federal funds. Estimates, while varied, have placed the cost for building a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border at anywhere from $12 billion to $25 billion. President Trump has consistently maintained that Mexico will pay for the wall, either up front or through some form of reimbursement. In the face of Mexico’s staunch and vocal unwillingness so far to do so, the EO directs the Secretary of State to submit to the president a report identifying sources of federal aid to the government of Mexico, including multilateral development aid, economic assistance, humanitarian aid, and military aid, as possible sources of funding that could be tapped to help finance the wall’s construction.

Elsewhere the EO instructs the Secretary to issue new policy guidance aimed at ending a practice whereby foreign nationals apprehended while attempting to illegally enter the United States were permitted to remain inside the United States instead of being held in a detention facility while awaiting a deportation order (colloquially referred to as “catch and release”). In other sections, the EO calls for the hiring of 5,000 additional border patrol agents and the immediate construction and operation of additional detention facilities at or near the U.S.-Mexico border.

(continued on page 4)
Arizona
An Arizona judge recently dismissed more than 1,100 lawsuits against Arizona businesses alleging that their parking lots are not accessible to persons with disabilities. The judge rejected the plaintiffs’ argument that the Arizonans with Disabilities Act permits any person who believes a place of public accommodation has violated the act to bring a civil action.

California
The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently reinstated a lawsuit brought by a California correctional officer who claimed that her supervisor created a sexually hostile work environment by, among other things, greeting her with hugs on more than 100 occasions. The court held “hugging can create a hostile or abusive workplace when it is unwelcome and pervasive.” Zetwick v. County of Yolo, No. 14-17341 (February 23, 2017).

District of Columbia
On February 15, Washington, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser signed into law the District of Columbia’s Fair Credit in Employment Amendment Act. The Act, which amends the District’s Human Rights Act of 1977, significantly restricts an employer’s ability to inquire into or use an applicant’s or employee’s credit history in making employment decisions.

Louisiana
On January 25, New Orleans Mayor Mitch Landrieu signed Executive Order MJL17-01, which prohibits questions about salary history during the application process for persons seeking employment with the City of New Orleans. The order further requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct a pay disparity study among city employees and submit the study to the mayor and chief administrative officer.

Maine
On January 30, Maine’s recreational marijuana law took effect. The new law makes it legal for Mainers age 21 or over to possess up to 2.5 ounces of marijuana for personal use. While employers need not tolerate employees being under the influence in the workplace, the law prohibits employers from refusing to employ or otherwise penalizing individuals solely because they use marijuana recreationally outside the employer’s property.

Massachusetts
A Massachusetts Superior Court judge recently held that meal breaks count as “compensable working time,” for which employees must be paid, unless the employee is relieved of all work-related duties. The court rejected the employer’s argument that the court should apply the more lenient federal standard, which focuses on whether the break time is spent “predominantly” for the benefit of the employer. DeVito v. Longwood Security Services, Inc., No. 2013-01724-BLS1 (December 23, 2016).

Mexico
On February 24, Mexico’s Official Gazette of the Federation published a decree that reformed and added several dispositions of Articles 107 and 123 of the Mexican Federal Constitution. The reform aims to consolidate autonomy of the labor justice system, promote efficiency in the administration of justice, and increase labor productivity.

Minnesota
A challenge brought in state court seeking a temporary injunction to prevent the Minneapolis Safe and Sick Time Ordinance from taking effect on July 1, 2017, was partially successful. Hennepin County District Judge Mel I. Dickstein denied a broad injunction, finding that the city had authority to enact the ordinance, but he granted a temporary injunction preventing its application to employers that are not located within the territorial limits of the city of Minneapolis. Meanwhile, the Minnesota legislature is considering bills that would preempt this ordinance and a similar one enacted by the city of St. Paul.

Missouri
On February 6, Governor Eric Greitens signed Senate Bill 19, making Missouri our nation’s 28th right-to-work state. In the last five years, five other states have passed right-to-work legislation (Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Kentucky). As per Article III, Secs. 20(a) and 29 of the Missouri Constitution, Missouri’s right-to-work statute will become effective on August 28, 2017.

New York
On February 22, the New York State Workers’ Compensation Board published proposed regulations that explain and clarify many aspects of the state’s new Paid Family Leave Law (PFL), including employers’ rights and responsibilities, employee eligibility, and the phase-in schedule of the PFL program. The PFL is scheduled to go into effect on January 1, 2018.

Oregon
The Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industries recently made a surprising change in its interpretation of the daily and weekly overtime requirements for manufacturers. Employers may be able to obtain a waiver from complying with this new interpretation if certain conditions are met (for example, the work schedule may not adversely affect the health and safety of the workers).

United Kingdom
The Court of Appeal recently dismissed an appeal by Pimlico Plumbers concerning the employment status of a former worker. The Court of Appeal ultimately agreed with the Employment Tribunal’s assessment that the worker was not in business on his own account but rather was an integral part of the company’s operations and subordinate to Pimlico Plumbers. Pimlico Plumbers Limited v. Smith, No. A2/2015/0196 (February 10, 2017).
EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT: A Q&A WITH EMPLOYEE RELATIONS CONSULTANT JATHAN JANOVE

by James M. McGrew (Atlanta)

Following a 25-year career as a labor and employment attorney, Jathan Janove now works with employers as an employee relations consultant, executive coach, and trainer. Using real-world stories, his most recent book, Hard-Won Wisdom: True Stories from the Management Trenches, draws from his professional experience to provide practical guidance to employers. You can learn more about him at www.jathanjanove.com.

Jim McGrew: In your book, Hard-Won Wisdom: True Stories from the Management Trenches, you state that most employment relationships are transactional but not engaged. What is the difference?

Jathan Janove: With transactional employees, it’s “I put in my time to get my pay. Then I go home, and life begins.” By contrast, engaged employees share a sense of purpose with their employers—they feel their efforts make a difference and that they’re connected as human beings, not merely cogs in a wheel.

JM: How do highly engaged employees contribute to the bottom line?

JJ: Numerous studies have shown that engaged workforces make a major difference in organizational success. One example: Fortune magazine commissioned a study of publicly traded companies that had made its 100 Best Companies To Work For list over a 17-year period. For companies that made the list at least once, total shareholder returns were nearly twice the S&P 500 average. And for the 13 companies that made the list all 17 years, total shareholder returns were over three times the S&P 500 average (495 percent to 156 percent.)

JM: In your book, you advocate that managers give “direct recognition” to employees who exhibit behavior worth repeating. What do you mean?

JJ: Human beings are wired to reciprocate. When an employee receives direct recognition of a specific action, he or she is likely to repeat that action and engage in other positive ones. One of the most effective ways managers can encourage desirable employee behavior is simply by not taking it for granted. Instead, express your appreciation directly to the employee. Even a simple “thank you” can be quite powerful.

JM: What is the most important thing a manager should do if an employee is not performing up to expectations?

JJ: “DIS” them. I don’t mean DIS as in disrespect but as in communicating Directly, Immediately, and Specifically. At the earliest possible opportunity, have a one-on-one, face-to-face conversation where you eschew labels like “unsatisfactory” or “unacceptable” and point out the specific behavior/action, its impact and results, and what needs to happen to solve the current problem and prevent its recurrence.

JM: How can a manager communicate negative performance feedback to an employee without the employee becoming embittered?

JJ: Don’t stop at feedback, continue with what Marshall Goldsmith calls “feedforward.” Pretend you’re driving a car. To drive safely, you periodically glance in the rearview mirror. However, where’s your primary attention? Hopefully, it’s through the front windshield to the road ahead. Negative performance feedback represents that glance in the rearview mirror. Don’t stay there. Explain the purpose is not to criticize but to align us on the road ahead. The conversation may start on the negative—the feedback—but it ends on the positive—the feedforward—an agreed action plan to solve the current problem and make improvements for future success.

JJ: What are the top things an employer can do to identify candidates who are likely to be successful in the job?

JM: In the book chapter on employee selection, I counsel employers to disconnect their “Stupid Switch,” which gets flipped when you conflate a candidate’s ability to get a job with their ability to do it. Instead, create a “star profile,” which is a succinct description of the behaviors/actions that distinguish success from failure in the specific job. Use the profile throughout the hiring process. This includes asking candidates how they see themselves in relation to each profile characteristic. If they say “that’s me!,” ask them to share a specific experience that demonstrates that characteristic in action. Ask them for contact information of people with personal knowledge of that experience, “so that I see how their recollection aligns with yours.” Among other benefits, this process weeds out the good-at-getting-but-not-at-doing candidates.

JJ: Finally, if you could give an employer one tip that you’ve gleaned from your experience, what would it be?

JM: To quote the late Peter F. Drucker, “The leader of the past knew how to tell. The leader of the future will be a person who knows how to ask.” The future is now. I spend a great deal of my professional time helping leaders develop their listening skills. Why? Because effective listening is perhaps the most powerful way a leader can align the efforts of others with a shared purpose, and replace top-down accountability (fear of consequence) with individual and peer ownership of responsibility. When practiced, the listening skills described in my book enable managers and executives to combine vision, humility, and tenacity—a potent combination for creating a highly engaged workplace.
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On February 20, 2017, Kelly issued a memorandum intended to guide implementation of this EO. The memorandum clarifies policy governing specific sections of the EO, and sets forth plans for increasing resources and personnel to accomplish the EO’s main goals of facilitating “the detection, apprehension, detention, and removal of aliens.”

Executive Order: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States (January 25, 2017)

The main thrust of this EO is to expand deportation efforts, in part, by cutting off federal funding to jurisdictions where local leaders do not cooperate with federal officials in identifying immigrants for deportation. Under the terms of the EO, and subject to the discretion of the U.S. Attorney General and DHS Secretary Kelly, these locations, known as “sanctuary cities,” would no longer be eligible to receive federal grants, except as deemed necessary for law enforcement. To further promote deportations, the EO dramatically expands the class of immigrants that the administrationpriorizes for removal beyond those with actual criminal records to include virtually any undocumented foreign national in the country. It also calls for Kelly to pursue agreements that could empower state and local law enforcement to perform the functions of an immigration officer.

Finally, and of direct relevance to employers, this EO authorizes Kelly to hire 10,000 additional U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers. This move signals the start of what will likely be a dramatic increase in enforcement raids by ICE at employer worksites across the country. Companies should review their Forms I-9 to ensure their workforces are fully compliant with federal law in preparation for these changes.

On February 20, 2017, Kelly issued a memorandum intended to guide implementation of this EO. The memorandum clarifies enforcement priorities established by the EO, directs an effort to expand resources devoted to various enforcement programs, and sets forth broad guidelines for the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in the handling of removable aliens.

Executive Order: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States (January 27, 2017 – Blocked by federal court order; revised and reissued March 6, 2017)

The EO that has received the most attention so far has been the so-called immigration travel ban. The original version of this EO put in place orders that would have suspended admission to the United States of foreign nationals from the following seven countries for a period of at least 90 days: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. The EO also suspended implementation of the Visa Interview Waiver Program (known also as “drop-box”). This order sparked sharp controversy during its implementation—an abrupt and somewhat uncertain process that resulted in chaos at ports of entry—and encountered immediate legal challenges.

On February 3, 2017, U.S. District Judge James L. Robart granted a temporary restraining order (TRO) that blocked implementation of several of the EO’s key sections. A Department of Justice challenge to the TRO was denied by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. In response to the court’s action, on March 6, 2017, President Trump issued a revised EO tailored to avoid some of the legal issues cited by the court. The revised EO took a more narrow approach than its predecessor, excluding green card holders and certain other categories of foreign nationals from the ban and leaving Iraq off the list of countries subject to the order. The new EO also revokes the original EO as of the new EO’s effective date of March 16, 2017. A number of states, including Washington, New York, and Oregon have taken steps to challenge the revised EO in court, and a federal judge in Hawaii ordered a new nationwide TRO on March 15, 2017, just hours before the revised EO was set to take effect, ensuring that the ultimate fate of the travel ban remains to be seen.

Other Executive Orders (Still Pending)

President Trump is also expected to issue several additional EOsin the coming weeks. Although final versions of these EOshave not yet been signed, leaked drafts have offered some insight into their possible provisions. The summaries below are based upon these leaked drafts. Specific provisions in the actual EOswill be subject to a formal rulemaking or legislative process.

• Protecting American Jobs and Workers by Strengthening the Integrity of Foreign Worker Visa Programs. According to the leaked draft, this EO calls broadly for added scrutiny and more stringent guidelines for a range of popular employment-based immigration programs, and ratchets up worksite investigations. Despite its longer-term ambitions, however, the EO is unlikely to have any immediate impact on the current law. Instead, the EO directs the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), and the U.S. Department of State (DOS) to conduct reviews of these work visa programs within varying time frames (30 days to two years), and then to propose new rules to align existing regulations with congressional intent and the national interest. In most cases, those new rules will be subject to a formal rulemaking or legislative process.

• Ending Unconstitutional Executive Amnesties. According to the leaked draft, this EO would end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program that provides deportation relief and work authorization to certain undocumented immigrants brought to the United States as children, but it would permit work authorization already issued under DACA to remain valid through its existing expiration date. President Trump has on several occasions expressed sympathy and a desire to find some relief for children who were brought to the United States without legal status when they were young and who are currently protected under DACA. Whether such relief will be established, and, if so, what it would consist of is not yet known. The EO would also immediately rescind Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA), a policy that had been created through executive action by President Barack Obama, but whose implementation had been blocked by court injunction.

• Protecting Taxpayer Resources by Ensuring Our Immigration Laws Promote Accountability and Responsibility. According to the leaked draft, this EO would seek to expand the “public charge” grounds upon which aliens could be determined to be inadmissible and deportable, investigate the public benefits that immigrants receive, and call on agencies to seek reimbursement for the cost of those benefits from sponsors who signed legally enforceable affidavits of support on behalf of the aliens.
OGLETREE DEAKINS CELEBRATES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

On February 14, 2017, Ogletree Deakins celebrated its 40th anniversary. The firm was founded in 1977, with a group of 16 attorneys, based in Greenville and Atlanta, committed to providing clients with outstanding service and exceptional value. In the 40 years since Ogletree Deakins first opened its doors as a Southeastern-based firm, it has grown to an international firm that includes more than 800 attorneys in 52 offices across the United States and in Canada, Mexico, and Europe.

“When we founded the firm in 1977, we established a set of values that we believe are the intangible qualities of success,” said Lewis Smoak, founding shareholder of Ogletree Deakins. “When I think back on the past 40 years, I am most proud that our culture and these essential values have endured. We are as committed as ever to our original principles, which include the highest ethical standards, integrity, teamwork, and client service.”

Ogletree Deakins’ commitment to client service has been repeatedly recognized by legal industry consultants and high-profile media, including The BTI Consulting Group and Client Choice, and the firm has been named a “Law Firm of the Year” by U.S. News – Best Lawyers® for six years in a row.

A few small, simple symbols, ubiquitous in legal documents—§, ¶, and ©—can become enormous ordeals in legal writing. Every lawyer knows the frustration of having to program in shortcut keys for legal symbols (or, worse, insert them manually) over and over again. Software updates, IT security measures, network settings—any one of those things can ruin pre-programmed shortcuts in word processors, throwing off a writer’s rhythm and stopping a brief in its tracks.

Enter the LegalBoard, a keyboard designed for lawyers. Not only does it have keys for each of those symbols, but also a single keystroke can add bullet points, footnotes, and commonplace words like “plaintiff,” as well as citations like “id.” Designed by lawyers, it is currently available at www.legalkeyboards.com.
Due to recent high-profile lawsuits, government regulations and enforcement efforts, and prolific activity from state legislatures, pay equity is at the forefront of issues facing employers today. Below are the top 10 issues employers should know—from what laws are at play to how employers can protect themselves from potential liability.

1. What laws provide protection against gender-based pay disparities?

There are a number of state and federal laws, plus additional federal regulations, that govern pay equity. The major federal laws at play are Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. Several states, including California, Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York, have passed pay equity legislation providing broader protections to employees than the existing laws, and other states and localities are considering similar measures.

2. Does pay equity apply only to gender, or does it apply to other protected characteristics as well?

Title VII’s prohibition against compensation discrimination applies to the other protected characteristics identified in that statute. Arguably, analogous federal laws with similar language prohibiting discrimination on the basis of other protected characteristics could support pay discrimination claims as well. Some of the newer state laws and regulations are expanding pay equity protections beyond gender to include other characteristics such as gender identity.

3. How can an employer determine whether it has a pay equity issue?

The primary way is through a pay audit. A pay audit typically begins with a fact investigation that provides information about the employer’s workforce and its compensation-related policies and practices. The pay data is analyzed to determine whether there are differences in how men and women (or between other protected classes, as appropriate) within identified jobs are compensated, and whether those differences are statistically significant.

4. Should employers conduct pay audits under the attorney-client privilege?

Conducting an audit under the attorney-client privilege may protect certain aspects of the audit from disclosure. Whether an audit is protected by the attorney-client privilege is a function of the state law defining that privilege. While typically the data underlying the analysis would not be privileged, the analysis and conclusions drawn as well as the strategy for addressing any concerns would be protected from disclosure.

5. What types of compensation should be reviewed to determine if there is a pay equity concern?

Arguably, all aspects of compensation may be considered in determining whether there is a pay equity issue—including bonuses and other incentives. If incentive compensation or other aspects of compensation are tied closely to base pay, the audit may need to include those forms of compensation.

6. Who is a “comparator” for determining if there is a pay equity concern?

Each statute defines the term differently. Under Title VII, a claimant must show that a “similarly situated” employee is compensated more favorably. New state laws have their own definitions. The identification of appropriate comparators is a function of the applicable law and the particular facts concerning the individuals whose pay is being analyzed.

7. How much of a pay difference will be considered a problem?

There is no set dollar amount that renders a pay difference “problematic.” In theory, any difference that cannot be explained could give rise to a concern. In reality, whether a pay difference is problematic will correlate to the amount of overall compensation involved and the factors included in the statistical model.

8. What steps can an employer take to make sure that it does not have pay disparities in the future?

A conscientious employer may take a critical look at its existing policies and procedures to identify deficiencies that may be causing pay disparities. Then, the employer can implement modifications to those policies and procedures to prevent pay disparities in the future.

9. What should an employer do if an employee complains about pay equity?

An employer should promptly investigate all allegations of pay bias. Oftentimes, internal complaints are grounded in rumors and suppositions about what another employee makes. Alternatively, if the claim can be substantiated, the employer will have the opportunity to promptly correct the issue and hopefully avoid the possibility of a future claim. Complaining or inquiring about compensation practices is a protected activity, so an employer must not retaliate against an employee who does so.

10. What might we expect in the future?

While the pace of enforcement efforts and regulations by the federal government may slow down under President Trump, the trend of state legislation related to pay equity will likely continue.
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Ogletree Deakins’ Drug Testing Practice Group—chaired by Boston shareholder Michael Clarkson—was created to harness our attorneys’ decades of experience advising and defending public and private employers and drug testing laboratories across the country. Here are some interesting facts about the practice group:

- The Drug Testing Practice Group roster has more than 65 experienced attorneys in 34 different offices across the United States and in Mexico.

- Our attorneys draft compliant drug testing policies tailored to our clients’ unique needs—ranging from policies that are compliant in more than 20 states to detailed policies that focus on a single state’s law.

- Developments in drug testing law as well as general best practices are covered on the Drug Testing blog, which covers noteworthy court decisions, related legislation, federal agency directives, and other hot topics. Recent articles include “Right to Light? Maine’s New Marijuana Law Prohibits Employers from Discrimination Against Recreational Users” and “Alcoholism and the ADA: The DOs and DON'Ts of Alcohol Testing in the Workplace.”

- According to the group’s chair, Michael Clarkson, one of the topics that causes the most confusion for employers is the conflict between the federal prohibition against marijuana and state-specific medical and recreational marijuana laws. Several members of the practice group have a particular focus on medical and recreational marijuana laws. With the widespread proliferation of marijuana laws, legalization (and its implications) is a concern for many employers. Our practice group members keep abreast of changes to prevent our clients from being blindsided.

- Several members have extensive experience assisting clients with drug testing under U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration rules and regulations.

- The practice group has an attorney who can field questions regarding state-specific drug testing inquiries in every state.

- The group is well versed on the implications of the Americans with Disabilities Act on drug and alcohol testing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ogletree Deakins Workshop Series: Discrimination and Retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22-23</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Benefits and Executive Compensation Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>Birmingham, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>Tifton, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td>An Employment Law Update After the First 60 Days of the New Presidential Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSHA’s Workplace Examination Rule Takes Effect on May 23: Know the New Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch-Ch-Ch-Ch-Changes...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Labor and Employment Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>St. Paul, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming a Super Sleuth - Conducting Effective Workplace Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Brookfield, WI</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 Updates on the Lifecycle of the Employment Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Greenville, SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Smart Form I-9 Workshop and Compliance Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>Franklin, TN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>Costa Mesa, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>Corpus Christi, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>McAllen, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>Appleton, WI</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 Updates on the Lifecycle of the Employment Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnishments and Other Wage Attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ogletree Deakins Workshop Series: Understanding and Engaging the Employment-Based Immigration System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Construction Contracting Fundamentals Series, Part I: Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ogletree Deakins Workshop Series: Immigration Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27</td>
<td>Greenville, SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FMLA to Z, Featuring ADA Interplay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3-6</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 National Workplace Strategies Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Skokie, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 Employment Law Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Needham, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Oak Brook, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 Employment Law Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 Employment Law Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Law Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stay Connected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>