

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

DIXON BEE COMPANY, LLC,)	Case No. 2024-CE-093
Respondent,)	
)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
and)	GENERAL COUNSEL’S REQUEST
)	FOR ENFORCEMENT OF
UNITED FARM WORKERS OF)	SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM
AMERICA,)	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
Charging Party.)	WIHTOUT PREJUDICE
)	
)	Administrative Order No. 2025-08
)	(July 28, 2025)

On June 30, 2025, the General Counsel of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board (ARLB or Board) filed with the Board a request for enforcement of subpoena duces tecum in the above-captioned unfair labor practice case.¹ The General Counsel alleged that, after respondent Dixon Bee Company, LLC (Dixon Bee) failed to provide documents in response to the General Counsel’s document requests, the General Counsel served Dixon Bee with a subpoena duces tecum on April 1. The General Counsel alleges that Dixon Bee did not petition to revoke the subpoena and, as of the date of the enforcement request, had not provided any documents in response to the subpoena.

Dixon Bee’s response to the enforcement request was due on July 8. Dixon Bee represented that, on that day, it provided responses to each of the document requests in the subpoena, including “over 600 documents/records.” Dixon Bee argued that, due to its

¹ All subsequent dates are in 2025.

belated compliance with the subpoena, the enforcement request should be dismissed as moot.

In considering requests to enforce subpoenas the Board considers whether the subpoena “was properly issued and the records sought are relevant to the charge investigation and identified with sufficient particularity.” (*St. Supéry, Inc.* (Sept. 28, 2022) ALRB Admin Order No. 2022-06-P, p. 6; *ALRB v. Laflin & Laflin* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 651, 663-664.) The Board finds that the subpoena meets this standard. Nevertheless, if Dixon Bee has provided a complete response to the subpoena, dismissal of the enforcement request would be appropriate, to the extent it is not withdrawn.

The completeness of Dixon Bee’s response is for the General Counsel to assess. Accordingly, the General Counsel shall provide a response to this order by August 11, 2025. If the General Counsel contends that Dixon Bee has not provided a complete response to the subpoena and judicial enforcement is appropriate at this time, the response shall identify what portions of the subpoena require enforcement. If enforcement is not sought at this time, any dismissal or withdrawal would be without prejudice to a renewed request to enforce this subpoena at a later time.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 28, 2025

Cinthia N. Flores, Acting Chair

Isadore Hall, III, Member

Barry D. Broad, Member

Ralph Lightstone, Member