

The Honorable John C. Coughenour

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

NICHOLAS P. TIDES,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C08-1601-JCC  
*Consolidated with C08-1736-JCC*

ORDER

MATTHEW C. NEUMANN,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 28), Plaintiffs’ Response and Cross Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 30), Defendant’s Reply (Dkt. No. 32), Defendant’s Response (Dkt. No. 33), and Plaintiffs’ Reply (Dkt. No. 34.) Having considered the parties’ briefing and the relevant record, the Court finds oral

1 argument unnecessary and hereby GRANTS Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and  
2 DENIES Plaintiffs' Cross Motion for Partial Summary Judgment.

### 3 I. BACKGROUND

4 Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("SOX"), 15 U.S.C. § 7262, requires  
5 publicly traded companies to assess the design and effectiveness of internal controls over financial  
6 reporting. In 2007, Boeing's Corporate Audit organization had two groups performing auditing and  
7 testing of these controls. (Def.'s Mot. 4 (Dkt. No. 28).) One group, Audit SOX Finance, performed  
8 audits and testing on financial-control groups. (*Id.*) The other group, Audit IT SOX, performed  
9 audits and testing on information-technology controls. (*Id.*) The Audit IT SOX group was staffed by  
10 Boeing employees and supplemented by contractors provided by the accounting firm  
11 PricewaterhouseCoopers ("PwC"). (*Id.*)

12 Nicholas P. Tides began working for Boeing in 2003 as an export compliance specialist.  
13 (Pl.'s Resp. 9 (Dkt. No. 30).) Matthew C. Neumann was hired by Boeing in 1997 and moved into  
14 auditing in 2004. Both men became Audit IT SOX auditors in January 2007. (*Id.* at 11.) During  
15 their employment, Tides and Neumann made several complaints to supervisors about perceived  
16 auditing deficiencies, but eventually came to the conclusion that Boeing's auditing culture was  
17 unethical and that the work environment was hostile to those who sought change. (*Id.* at 7.)  
18 Eventually, Tides and Neumann felt the situation was serious enough that they contacted Andrea  
19 James, a reporter from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and provided her with information and  
20 documents. (*Id.* at 9; Def.'s Mot. at 11 (Dkt. No. 28).) When Boeing became aware of the contact  
21 and disclosures made to the reporter, Tides and Neumann were placed on suspension, and the matter  
22 was referred to a Boeing Employee Corrective Action Review Board ("ECARB"). (Def.'s Mot. 11  
23 (Dkt. No. 28).) The ECARB convened on September 26, 2007, voted unanimously to terminate  
24 both Tides and Neumann, and informed the men of these decisions on September 28 and October 1,  
25 respectively. (*Id.* at 12.) Tides and Neumann filed whistleblower complaints with the Occupational  
Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) on December 26, 2007 and December 21, 2007,  
respectively. (*Id.*) After delays with OSHA, Plaintiffs decided to proceed in federal court. On

1 October 8, 2008 and November 7, 2008, respectively, OSHA issued letters acknowledging  
2 Plaintiffs Tides and Neumann's right to proceed *de novo* in federal court.

## 3 **II. APPLICABLE LAW**

### 4 **A. Summary Judgment Standard**

5 Summary judgment shall be rendered "if the pleadings, depositions, answers to  
6 interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no  
7 genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a  
8 matter of law." FED. R. CIV. P. 56(c). Rule 56 "mandates the entry of summary judgment, after  
9 adequate time for discovery and upon motion, against a party who fails to make a showing  
10 sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party's case, and on which that  
11 party will bear the burden of proof at trial." *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986).

### 11 **B. Whistleblower Protection Under SOX**

12 Section 806 of SOX, 18 USC § 1514A(a)(1), prohibits employers of publicly traded  
13 companies from "discriminat[ing] against an employee in the terms and conditions of  
14 employment" for "provid[ing] information . . . regarding any conduct which the employee  
15 reasonably believes constitutes a violation of section 1341 [mail fraud], 1343 [wire fraud], 1344  
16 [bank fraud], or 1348 [securities fraud], any rule or regulation of the Securities and Exchange  
17 Commission, or any provision of Federal law relating to fraud against shareholders." *See Van  
18 Asdale v. Int'l Game Tech.*, 577 F.3d 989, 996 (9th Cir. 2009).

19 Section 1514A(b)(2) further specifies that § 1514A claims are governed by the  
20 procedures applicable to whistleblower claims brought under 49 U.S.C. § 42121(b). Section  
21 42121(b)(2)(B), in turn, sets forth a burden-shifting procedure by which a plaintiff is first  
22 required to make out a *prima facie* case of retaliatory discrimination; if the plaintiff meets this  
23 burden, the employer assumes the burden of demonstrating by clear and convincing evidence  
24 that it would have taken the same adverse employment action in the absence of the plaintiff's  
25 protected activity. *See id.*

1           **III. ANALYSIS**

2           The Court concludes first that SOX does not prohibit termination for disclosures to the  
3 media. Second, the Court finds that whether or not Tides and Neumann engaged in any activity  
4 protected by SOX, Boeing was entitled to terminate them for leaking confidential documents to  
5 the media. The Court finds that it need not consider whether Tides and Neumann have made a  
6 *prima facie* case. Boeing has shown by clear and convincing evidence that it would have  
7 terminated Tides and Neumann for their disclosures to the media even in the absence of activity  
8 that may have been protected.

9           **A. Whistleblowing to the Media is not Protected Activity**

10           Communications with the media are not protected by SOX. Section 806(1)(a) of SOX  
11 protects employees against retaliation from employers when the employee provides information or  
12 assistance to “(A) a Federal regulatory or law enforcement agency; (B) any Member of Congress or  
13 any committee of Congress; or (C) a person with supervisory authority over the employee (or such  
14 other person working for the employer who has the authority to investigate, discover, or terminate  
15 misconduct).” 18 U.S.C. 1514(a)(1). Plaintiffs concede that this list is the most specific of all  
16 whistleblower-protection statutes, but asks the Court to read it expansively. (Pl.’s Resp. 29 n.126  
17 (Dkt. No. 30).)

18           Plaintiffs seek to draw parallels to other statutes with more expansive whistleblower  
19 protection, but by the clear language of § 806, such comparisons are without merit. Plaintiff also  
20 refers to a letter from an OSHA investigator, which states “OSHA’s position is that talking to the  
21 press is a protected activity under SOX. I also mentioned the *Overall* case as one source of authority  
22 to support OSHA’s position. *See In the Matter of: Curtis C. Overall, Complainant v. Tennessee*  
23 *Valley Authority, Respondent*, ARB Case No. 04-073, ALJ Case No. 99-ERA-25, July 16 2007.”  
24 (Pl.’s Resp. Ex. 1 (Dkt. No. 30).) The Case referenced in the letter deals with the Energy  
25 Reorganization Act, not SOX, and is also inapposite.

1 Congress has made clear that while SOX was intended to protect whistleblowers, only  
2 certain types of whistleblowing would be afforded protection. Leaking documents to the media is  
3 not one of them.

4 **B. Plaintiffs Failed to Show Pretext**

5 Tides and Neumann argue that Boeing's reliance on the media disclosures to fire them was  
6 merely a pretext, and that the firings actually occurred as a response to protected activity such as  
7 complaints to their supervisors. The stated grounds for their dismissal must have been pretext,  
8 Plaintiffs argue, because dissemination of information outside the company is permitted by  
9 Boeing corporate policies. (Pl.'s Resp. 33–34 (Dkt. No. 30).) Boeing Procedure 3439 states:  
10 “Nothing in this procedure should be construed as preventing employees from: 1. Discussing or  
11 releasing information about wages, hours, working conditions, or other terms and conditions of  
12 employment to the extent privileged by Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act or other  
13 law.” (Pl.'s Resp. Ex. 2 (Dkt. No. 30).)

13 Boeing's position is that unauthorized media leaks are a violation of confidentiality  
14 rules, and are not privileged by the NLRA. Boeing maintains a set of policies and  
15 procedures governing the sharing of company information with outsiders. (Def.'s Mot. 10  
16 (Dkt. No. 28).) Boeing claims that Tides and Neumann were aware of these policies and  
17 were reminded of them in April 2007. (*Id.*)

17 First, the Court examines whether Tides and Neumann's disclosures were privileged by the  
18 NLRA. Section 7 of the NLRA states:

19 Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor  
20 organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own  
21 choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective  
22 bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to  
23 refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may  
24 be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a  
25 condition of employment as authorized in section 158 (a)(3) of this title.

23 29 U.S.C. § 157. It is true that the hostile work environment described by Tides and  
24 Neumann could be considered “working conditions.” *See Ft. Stewart Sch. v. Fed. Labor*

1 *Relations Auth.*, 495 U.S. 641, 645–46 (U.S. 1990) (quoting *Dep’t of Def. Dependents*  
2 *Sch. v. FLRA*, 274 U.S. App. D.C. 299, 301, 863 F. 2d 988, 990 (1988) (“The term  
3 ‘working conditions’ ordinarily calls to mind the day-to-day circumstances under which  
4 an employee performs his or her job”). But Boeing policies only protect the release of  
5 information about working conditions to the extent privileged by Section 7. And this  
6 section relates exclusively to the formation of unions and the practice of collective  
7 bargaining. Tides and Neumann have offered no reason to believe that their statements and  
8 disclosures, allegedly related to fraud and a hostile work environment designed to conceal  
9 that fraud, should be protected by Section 7 of the NLRA. The Court finds that Boeing  
policies do not protect the disclosures made by Tides and Neumann.

10 Second, the Court examines whether Boeing’s reasons for dismissal were pretextual.  
11 The Court looks to a similar case in the Ninth Circuit for instruction. In *Van Asdale*, 577  
12 F.3d 989 (9th Cir. 2009), the plaintiffs were in-house intellectual-property attorneys for a  
13 gaming-machines company who had recently received high-level promotions. Shawn  
14 Van Asdale was fired for poor performance seventeen days after receiving an exceptional  
15 performance review. Lena Van Asdale was fired several weeks later for requesting  
16 sensitive company information. Three days prior to Shawn’s termination, the Van  
17 Asdales mentioned to their supervisor that they suspected securities fraud had occurred in  
18 a recent merger. The court held that a reasonable fact-finder could determine that the  
19 asserted grounds for dismissal were pretextual for four reasons: (1) the contrast between  
20 the employer’s account of Shawn’s poor performance and his record of promotions and  
21 excellent performance reviews; (2) the conclusory support for the employer’s contention  
22 that Lena’s requests were improper; (3) a complete lack of specific evidence supporting  
the employer’s claims of poor performance; and (4) the close proximity of Shawn’s firing  
to the alleged protected activity. *Id.* at 1004.

23 Tides and Neumann have not shown that Boeing’s actions were similarly  
24 pretextual. The grounds for dismissal were not vague and unsupported as they were in

1 *Van Asdale*. Tides and Neumann do not deny that they provided internal documents to a  
2 reporter; they merely claim that such actions are protected. The Court has found that they  
3 are not. Accordingly, Boeing has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that Tides  
4 and Neumann would have been dismissed independently of any activity protected under  
5 SOX.

6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby GRANTS Defendant's Motion for Summary  
8 Judgment (Dkt. No. 28) and DENIES Plaintiffs' Cross Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt.  
9 No. 30). The Clerk is DIRECTED to close the case.

10 SO ORDERED this 9th day of February, 2010.

11  
12  
13 

14  
15  
16 John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE