

# NLRB Rejects Ban On Personal E-mail At Work

December 17, 2014

On December 11, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) continued to intrude into the workplace by holding that employees have a right to use their employer's email system for union organizing purposes and other "concerted activities." This decision (*Purple Communications, Inc. and Communications Workers of America*, AFL CIO, 361 NLRB No. 126) reverses prior NLRB precedent and continues the Board's trend of expanding its relevance into all workplace settings. The *Purple Communications* decision is just the latest move by the NLRB to regulate company policies that limit employees' communications in the workplace and about work. The NLRB hasn't been shy about taking on company policies regarding confidentiality and the use of social media. Among other things, the NLRB has deemed unlawful company prohibitions on employee critiques of management. This has been the case even where the workplace is not unionized. In *Purple Communications*, the NLRB scrutinized a standard policy limiting company email use to business purposes and prohibiting personal email use. Previously, the NLRB held that employees have no right to use company email systems for concerted activities. However, the NLRB has now concluded its precedent was "clearly incorrect," holding that email has become a critical means of communication, essential to concerted activities. Importantly, the NLRB noted that it will be the rare case where a company can restrict email. Lengthy dissents were issued by two Board members, pointing out that the decision is confusing, difficult to apply, interferes with employer's legitimate interests, and violates employers' First Amendment rights. If the policy imposes a complete ban on personal use, it is unlikely to be upheld by the NLRB and will have to be carefully tailored based on the nature and needs of your business. This tailoring process should involve input from legal, human resources, IT, and business constituents of your organization.

## Authored By



James M. Sconzo



Jonathan Sterling

## Related Practices

[Labor & Employment](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.