

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO
A Professional Law Corporation
Ruth M. Bond State Bar No. 214582
Ruth.Bond@aalrr.com
Jenica D. Maldonado State Bar No. 266982
Jenica.Maldonado@aalrr.com
Joshua Wiser State Bar No. 305193
Joshua.Wiser@aalrr.com
3 Harbor Drive, Suite 200
Sausalito, California 94965-1491
Telephone: (628) 234-6200
Fax: (628) 234-6899

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION
AUTHORITY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

SANTA CLARA VALLEY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY,

PLAINTIFF,

v.

AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR-
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATIONS (AFL-CIO), LOCAL
UNION 265; and DOES 1 through 10
inclusive

DEFENDANT.

Case No. 25CV460740

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF BASED ON
BREACH OF CONTRACT AND
BREACH OF IMPLIED COVENANT OF
GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING**

E-FILED
3/10/2025 10:54 PM
Clerk of Court
Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara
25CV460740
Reviewed By: C. Roman

*[Fee exempt Pursuant to
Govt. Code § 6103]*

I. INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFF The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (“VTA”) and DEFENDANT Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, Division 265 (“Local 265”) are parties to a written collective bargaining agreement (“CBA” or “Agreement”) covering more than 1,500 workers in 37 different classifications, including Bus Operators, Dispatchers, Mechanics, Paint & Body Workers and Forepersons, who are critical to the operation of VTA’s buses, light rail, and other operations. These workers deliver direct service to tens of thousands of members of the public every day—almost one hundred thousand per day during peak service.

2. The CBA prohibits strikes both during the term of the contract as well as during negotiations for a successor contract, and until such successor contract is in effect. Section 23 of the CBA states:

SECTION 23 - CONTINUITY OF SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

It is recognized that the parties are engaged in rendering a public service and that they will comply with all applicable valid rules, regulations and orders of duly constituted public regulatory bodies or governmental authorities. The parties contract that nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to conflict or be inconsistent or incompatible with such rules, regulations or orders.

During the term of this Agreement, neither the Union nor its members shall call, sanction, assist, engage in any strike, slow-down or stoppage of VTA work, operations or service, or in any manner sanction, assist or engage in any restrictions or limitations of the work, operations, or service of VTA.

This no-strike clause dates back as far as the parties’ 1974 agreement.

3. Regarding duration, the CBA states: “The term of this Agreement shall begin on March 7, 2022, and continues through March 3, 2025, *and from year to year thereafter.*” (CBA § 25 (emphasis added).) The CBA also provides that during contract negotiations, the Agreement “shall remain in full force and effect.” (*Id.*)

4. Despite the no-strike provision, on March 10, 2025, ATU commenced a strike which effectively halted all bus and light rail services delivered to thousands of riders. These riders rely on VTA transportation services to go to work, school, and medical appointments. Many do not have a reliable alternative option.

breach of such collective bargaining agreement by any party thereto shall be subject to the same remedies, including injunctive relief, as are available on other contracts in the courts of this State.”

14. Venue is proper in this County, as Defendant has publicly announced and commenced a strike at VTA which is within Santa Clara County. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant conducts business and operates within Santa Clara County in order to provide services to its bargaining unit members at VTA. The CBA between the parties covers VTA. A breach of contract action may be brought in the county where the breach occurs. (Code Civ. Proc., §395.5.) Therefore, ATU’s strike at VTA constitutes a breach of the no-strike provision of the CBA and makes this county proper for venue.

15. VTA is subject to the labor relations provisions set forth in the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Act (“Act”), as prescribed under Public Utilities Code, Chapter 6 (Personnel), Article 1 (Labor Relations), set forth in Sections 100200 through 100381. The Act expressly provides that the Meyers-Milias Brown Act (“MMBA”), Chapter 10, Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code, Gov. Code §§ 3500 is “not applicable to VTA.” (PUC Code § 100307.) The Public Employment Relations Board (“PERB”) has no jurisdiction over the present dispute.

16. Sections 100300 through 100381 of the Act govern labor relations matters. Section 100304, titled “Mediation,” provides that “[i]f, after a reasonable period of time, representatives of the VTA and the accredited representatives of the employees fail to reach agreement on the terms of a written contract governing wages, hours, pensions, and working conditions or the interpretation or application of terms of an existing agreement, either party may request mediation services of the [California State Mediation and] Conciliation Service [CSMCS].” Title 1, Division 4.5, Chapter 3 of the Government Code concerning Public Transportation Labor Disputes similarly provides that either party may request mediation with CSMCS. (Gov. Code § 3611, subd. (d).)

III. PARTIES

17. PLAINTIFF is the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (“VTA”), a special district, as defined and recognized under Public Utilities Code section 100000 (2024), with its

1 statutory territory in Santa Clara County and its administrative offices located in San Jose,
2 California.

3 18. DEFENDANT is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendant
4 Amalgamated Transit Union, American Federation Of Labor-Congress Of Industrial
5 Organizations (AFL-CIO), Local Union 265, is and at all times has been, a mutual benefit
6 corporation. Plaintiff is informed and believes that ATU has its principal place of business at
7 1590 La Pradera Drive, Campbell, California 95008-1533. ATU represents more than 1,500
8 individuals employed at VTA in 37 classifications including Bus Operators, Dispatchers,
9 Mechanics, Paint & Body Workers and other classifications critical to the operation of VTA's
10 buses and light rail system.

11 19. The true names and capacities of defendants DOES ONE through TEN are
12 unknown to VTA, and VTA will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to allege such names
13 and capacities as soon as they are ascertained.

14 IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

15 20. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority is an independent special district that
16 provides sustainable, accessible, community-focused transportation options that are innovative,
17 environmentally responsible, and promote the vitality of the region.

18 21. VTA provides bus, light rail, and paratransit services, as well as participates as a
19 funding partner in regional rail service including Caltrain, Capitol Corridor, and the Altamont
20 Corridor Express.

21 22. As the county's congestion management agency, VTA is responsible for
22 countywide transportation planning, including congestion management, design and construction of
23 specific highway, pedestrian, and bicycle improvement projects, as well as promotion of transit-
24 oriented development.

25 23. VTA provides these services throughout the county, including Campbell,
26 Cupertino, Gilroy, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill,
27 Mountain View, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Saratoga and Sunnyvale. VTA continually
28 builds partnerships to deliver transportation solutions that meet the evolving mobility needs of

1 Santa Clara County.

2 24. Defendant ATU represents approximately 1,573 of VTA's 2,304 employees in 37
3 different classifications including Bus Operator, Dispatcher, Transit Mechanic, Service Mechanic,
4 Upholsterer, Foreperson, Facilities Worker, Maintenance Worker, Track Worker, Rail Operator
5 and Fare Inspector. These workers are assigned to nine different sections within VTA.

6 25. VTA and ATU entered into a collective bargaining agreement for the period March
7 7, 2022, through March 3, 2025, and from year-to-year thereafter.

8 26. The CBA includes a no-strike clause that recognizes the importance of the public
9 services provided by VTA through the employees covered by the contract. It provides:

10 SECTION 23 - CONTINUITY OF SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

11 It is recognized that the parties are engaged in rendering a public
12 service and that they will comply with all applicable valid rules,
13 regulations and orders of duly constituted public regulatory bodies or
14 governmental authorities. The parties contract that nothing contained
15 in this Agreement shall be construed to conflict or be inconsistent or
16 incompatible with such rules, regulations or orders.

17 During the term of this Agreement, neither the Union nor its members
18 shall call, sanction, assist, engage in any strike, slow-down or
19 stoppage of VTA work, operations or service, or in any manner
20 sanction, assist or engage in any restrictions or limitations of the
21 work, operations, or service of VTA.

22 The Union will require its members to perform their services for VTA
23 when required by VTA to do so except for a refusal by VTA to abide
24 by the terms of the arbitration or grievance procedure of this
25 Agreement. Refusal of employees to cross a primary picket line of
26 another employer, if approved by the Central Labor Council, shall not
27 be cause for discipline nor construed as a violation of the Agreement.

28 During the term of the Agreement, VTA shall not cause or permit any
lockout of any of its employees.

Section 23 is in full force and effect.

27. Section 25 of the CBA addresses duration of the agreement. It provides:

SECTION 25 – DURATION OF AGREEMENT

The term of this Agreement shall begin on March 7, 2022, and
continues through March 3, 2025, and from year to year thereafter.

Should either party desire to terminate this Agreement or alter it in
any way, they shall give the other party written notice 90 days prior
to March 3, 2025, or any subsequent March 3rd. Such notice shall

state either the intent to terminate the Agreement at the end of the 90 day period or to negotiate amendments or changes stated in the notice.

The party receiving such 90 day notice shall, within 30 days prior to March 3, 2025, or any subsequent March 3rd, notify the other party in writing of its intent to terminate this Agreement or negotiate amendments or changes stated in its responding notice.

Negotiations on the amendments or changes of this Agreement shall begin no later than 15 days prior to March 3, 2025, or any subsequent March 3rd and shall continue until agreement is reached. During these negotiations, this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

Changes to this Agreement are effective the first pay period following ratification, unless otherwise agreed.

28. Over the past ten years, VTA has agreed to wage increases for ATU members as follows: In the CBA for the period 2016-2019 a wage increase of 10.35% over three years; for the period 2019-2022, an increase of 10.5% over three years, and for the period 2022-2025, an increase of 10% over three years. ATU's proposal for a wage increase of 18% over three years (19.1% compounded) is inconsistent with the increases that ATU has received over this past decade.

29. ATU never provided VTA notice of an Intent to Terminate the Agreement, either in writing or otherwise, and not 90 days prior to March 3, 2025, or at any other time.

30. On July 8, 2024, ATU advised VTA General Manager Carolyn Gonot that it wished "to negotiate amendments or changes to the CBA" ("Notice of Intent to Negotiate"). The Notice of Intent to Negotiate specifically cited the following sections: "Part A, Section 5, 11, 15.2, 18." These sections relate to wages, vacation, dental plan and discipline and discharge, respectively.

31. On July 17, 2024, in response to ATU's Notice of Intent to Negotiate, VTA advised ATU in writing that VTA was "prepared to negotiate amendments or changes to the CBA," including but not limited to 18 cited sections of the CBA. Neither party cited sections 23 or 25 of the CBA in these letters stating their respective intentions to negotiate certain CBA provisions.

32. In August 2024, ATU and VTA began negotiating the successor contract. ATU made an opening offer to increase its members' base wages by 24% over 3 years, with an 8% increase each year (8-8-8). VTA responded with an initial counter-offer of a 3.75% increase to

base wages over 3 years, as follows: 1%, 1.25% and 1.5%. ATU did not reciprocate on its wage proposal. Yet, on November 7, VTA made further concessions and increased its wage proposal from 3.75% to 4.5% (1.25-1.5-1.75). Despite VTA's numerous attempts to get ATU to negotiate, ATU did not move from its initial offer of 24% over 3 years. Between August 2024 and January 2025, ATU responded 12 times to VTA's requests for a counter with the same identical proposal (24% over 3 years, 8-8-8). As a result, VTA proposed that the parties mediate and ATU agreed to do so.

33. Prior to mediation, ATU did not condition their participation on any terms, including that, absent reaching a tentative agreement during mediation, ATU would conclude that the parties had reached impasse. Moreover, in the weeks before mediation, ATU submitted 8 new contract proposals to VTA during regularly scheduled negotiation sessions: on January 14, 2025, ATU presented 4 new proposals and commented that they have more new proposals to present at the next meeting; on January 16, 2025, ATU presented 2 new proposals; and on January 21, ATU presented an additional 2 new proposals. The parties did not have an opportunity to meaningfully discuss, much less agree on, any of these 8 proposals prior to the start of mediation.

34. The parties participated in pre-impasse mediation on January 30, February 2 and February 5, 2025. Mediation did not result in a Tentative Agreement.

35. On February 13, 2025, the parties held another bargaining session. ATU began the session by stating, inaccurately, that VTA had declared impasse. VTA advised ATU that this was incorrect and proceeded to present a package of proposals, including an offer to increase ATU members' base wages by 9% over 3 years (3-3-3), or 9.3% compounded, with an additional one-time payment of \$500. ATU questioned whether the package was VTA's LBFO; VTA confirmed that it was not. ATU President Rajvinder Singh questioned why VTA had agreed to resume negotiations when the parties had already reached impasse. Mr. Escobar reiterated that VTA had never indicated that the parties were at impasse and noted that historically the parties engaged in pre-impasse mediation as a past practice. Mr. Singh urged Mr. Escobar to provide a timeline for reaching a deal. Mr. Escobar advised, "as soon as possible." ATU agreed to present VTA's package to its membership for a vote on February 19.

1 36. On February 20, 2025, Mr. Singh wrote to VTA General Manager Carolyn Gonot.
2 He advised that ATU membership had voted on VTA’s most recent package proposal and that the
3 membership had rejected the offer. He also advised that 96% of the vote participants had
4 “authorized strike sanction”—an apparent reference to a provision bearing the same title in the
5 ATU International Constitution and General Rules. This section of such rules prescribes a process
6 that local chapters must follow to obtain approval of the international union governing body
7 before proceeding with a strike. His email also again asked VTA to make a LBFO.

8 37. On February 21, 2025, Ms. Gonot responded, writing, “[g]iven where we are at in
9 the process, VTA is not in a position to declare a last, best and final offer (LBFO) at this time.”
10 She explained why the present package demonstrated VTA’s efforts to continue to engage in good
11 faith negotiations and that ATU had a similar obligation. She noted that ATU had yet to respond
12 to VTA’s then-present offer—3-3-3 percent increase over 3 years (9.3% compounded) with a one-
13 time lump sum payment—and that ATU had not moved from its August 2024 position (8-8-8
14 percentage increase in pay).

15 38. On February 25, 2025, ATU presented a counterproposal for an 18% pay increase
16 over 3 years (6-6-6), or 19.1% compounded.

17 39. On the morning of February 28, 2025, VTA met with its Board of Directors in a
18 closed session. Afterward, VTA and ATU held a bargaining session in the early afternoon around
19 approximately 2:00 p.m. At that session, VTA presented a proposal of 9% over 3 years, with an
20 increase of 4% in year one, 3% in year two, and 2% in year 3 (i.e., 4-3-2), and a one-time payment
21 of \$1,500. The proposed pay increase maintained VTA’s competitive wage for its employees who
22 are currently the second highest paid in the region compared to their counterparts at other
23 agencies, and the fifth highest paid in the country.

24 40. ATU’s negotiating team looked at the offer, made a few critical comments, and left
25 the room. The entire meeting lasted eight minutes. On February 28, at approximately 4:49 p.m.,
26 ATU’s President sent Ms. Gonot a communication indicating that the Union did not intend to
27 move from the position it last presented on February 25, 2025—a wage increase of 18% over 3
28 years (19.1% compounded), with increases of 6% each year (6-6-6).

1 41. Mr. Singh claimed that reiteration of their prior position constituted the Union's
2 LBFO and declared impasse. He did so less than three hours after receiving VTA's LBFO that
3 contained substantial sweeteners (bumping up the first-year increase to 4%, a \$1,500 per employee
4 signing bonus, and increasing the annual dental benefit to \$3,000 a year).

5 42. On February 28, in a memorandum posted on ATU's website to its membership
6 concerning the status of negotiations, Mr. Singh advised, "[w]e will resubmit our Last, Best &
7 Final. While we wait for a possible response, a Special Membership meeting will be held on
8 Friday, March 7, 2025, with location TBD." In the less-than-three-hours that transpired between
9 ATU's rejection of VTA's LBFO (i.e., at a 2:00 p.m. negotiation meeting) and Mr. Singh's
10 message to Ms. Gonot with what he characterized as ATU's counter-LBFO (i.e., before 5:00
11 p.m.), there was no plausible opportunity for ATU's members to consider and vote on VTA's
12 LBFO or their counter-LBFO. Moreover, Mr. Singh's memorandum is misleading because it
13 suggests the Union submitted a LBFO to VTA before February 28 when it clearly had not.

14 43. Despite the clear and unambiguous language of the no-strike clause, not to mention
15 the March 7 meeting still scheduled with their membership, ATU announced on the evening of
16 March 6, 2025, to VTA's Board of Directors that its members would begin striking on March 10,
17 2025. In a letter dated March 6, 2025, hereinafter "Strike Notice," addressed to VTA's Board
18 Chair Sergio Lopez, Mr. Singh stated that ATU was providing "notice of its intent to engage in a
19 strike, picketing, and other protected concerted activity at all locations and times permitted under
20 law. Strike, picketing and other protected concerted activity will begin on or after March 10,
21 2025, at 12:01 a.m." Accordingly, there was also no plausible opportunity for Union membership
22 to vote and approve commencement of a strike prior to Mr. Singh serving the March 6th notice of
23 intent to strike.

24 44. A strike by ATU is an act of bad faith and a breach of contract, an express violation
25 of the no-strike clause in the MOU which remains in full force and effect after March 3 while the
26 parties negotiate a successor agreement. All terms of the MOU remain in effect during this period,
27 including the no-strike provisions. These provisions exist because in past negotiation cycles the
28 parties understood and agreed that the public services rendered by ATU members are vital, and

1 that if future negotiations cycles ran past expiration, both parties would enjoy the full protection of
2 the CBA while they endeavored in good faith to reach agreement on its successor.

3 45. On March 10, 2025, at approximately 12:01 a.m., ATU commenced a strike.
4 Starting at approximately 4:00 a.m. on March 10, ATU picketers have been protesting at VTA's
5 North, Cerone, Chaboya, and River Oaks campuses. At some sites (including Cerone and
6 Guadalupe), picketers were blocking at least some entrances, including main entrances. VTA
7 contracts with the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department to provide on-site security on a
8 regular basis. Sheriff's deputies have sought the Union's cooperation and have advised picketers
9 to refrain from blocking entrances; some picketers have refused to comply. Picketers have
10 challenged deliveries from VTA's outside vendors that require ingress and egress into the
11 property. VTA staff who have attempted to report to work on Monday have been turned away as
12 a result of the picketing.

13 46. As explained below, this strike will cause irreparable harm to thousands of VTA
14 customers.

15 47. The strike affects thousands of riders who depend on VTA to reach schools, work
16 and medical appointments. Up to 90,000 customers throughout the region rely on VTA's bus and
17 light rail services.

18 48. ATU's strike has halted service on VTA's 46 bus routes, including 4 express bus
19 routes, three light rail lines, and stopped other services including customer service, rail station
20 maintenance, and bus and light rail vehicle maintenance teams.

21 49. VTA's most recent operations data regarding ridership shows that the "average
22 boardings" per weekday are 98,000. ("Average boardings" means the number of times someone
23 boarded a bus or light rail train rather than the number of unique individuals riding every day.)
24 The average boardings per weekend day are 57,000.

25 50. Following is a snapshot of ridership data:

26
27 ///

Ridership w/ Weekday, Saturday and Sunday January 2025			
Ridership	January 2025	January 2024	Percent Change
Bus	1,981,454	1,754,234	13.0%
Average Weekday	74,155	65,444	13.3%
Average Saturday	43,020	37,403	15.0%
Average Sunday	35,591	32,970	7.9%
Light Rail	384,758	402,768	-4.5%
Average Weekday	14,326	13,423	6.7%
Average Saturday	8,360	9,763	-14.4%
Average Sunday	7,227	13,679	-47.2%
System	2,366,212	2,157,002	9.7%
Average Weekday	88,481	78,867	12.2%
Average Saturday	51,380	47,166	8.9%
Average Sunday	42,818	46,649	-8.2%

51. VTA statistics regarding ridership show that shutdown in services especially impacts certain sectors of the population including seniors, people with disabilities and low-income riders. Data shows the following:

- 6,370 trips per weekday made by riders who speak “no English at all” (6.5% of riders)
- 4,018 trips per weekday made by riders who are 65 years or older (4.1% of riders)
- 82,026 trips per weekday made by riders who are non-white, non-Hispanic (83.7% of our riders)
- 20,482 trips per weekday made by riders who have income of less than \$15,000 per year (20.9% of riders); and
- 4,214 trips per weekday made by riders who have a disability (4.3% of riders).

These riders, who are riding fixed routes despite their disability, may be eligible for VTA ACCESS paratransit service and may switch to use ACCESS in the event of fixed route service shutdown. Increase in demand for paratransit may impact VTA’s ability to effectively serve those riders because of delays and denials of service caused by increase in demand.

52. Data also shows that cessation in service will impact many customers’ ability to get to medical appointments, school and work. Trip data shows:

- 2,254 trips per weekday going to/from a medical/hospital appointment (2.3% of trips)
- 19,502 trips per weekday going to/from college/university (19.9% of trips)
- 7,448 trips per weekday going to/from K-12 school (7.6% of trips)
- 38,808 trips per weekday going to/from work (39.6% of trips)

53. Fare Revenue for FY2025 is approximately \$25.9 million, \$2.2 million monthly, and roughly \$72,000 daily. Revenue from Paratransit service is approximately \$1.5 million for FY 2025. While VTA has continued paratransit services, which are provided through an outside vendor, upon information and belief, the shutdown of bus and light rail service has increased demand on paratransit.

54. Without immediate injunctive relief, VTA will suffer irreparable harm to its operations, as well as harm to the provision of vital transportation services to the public.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Contract

55. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.

56. VTA entered into a written contract called a Collective Bargaining Agreement (“Agreement” or “CBA”) with ATU Local 265. The CBA covers more than 1,500 of VTA’s employees in numerous classifications that are critical to operation of VTA’s bus and light rail services, including Bus Operators, Bus Dispatcher, Transit Radio Dispatcher, Service Mechanic, Transit Mechanic, O & R Mechanic, Paint and Body Worker, Forepersons, Rail Operators, Track Workers, Electronic Technicians and other classifications.

57. In past bargaining, VTA made substantial economic concessions to VTA in order to achieve the labor peace that comes with having a CBA in effect with a no-strike clause. That clause provides:

SECTION 23 - CONTINUITY OF SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

It is recognized that the parties are engaged in rendering a public service and that they will comply with all applicable valid rules, regulations and orders of duly constituted public regulatory bodies or governmental authorities. The parties contract that nothing contained

in this Agreement shall be construed to conflict or be inconsistent or incompatible with such rules, regulations or orders.

During the term of this Agreement, neither the Union nor its members shall call, sanction, assist, engage in any strike, slow-down or stoppage of VTA work, operations or service, or in any manner sanction, assist or engage in any restrictions or limitations of the work, operations, or service of VTA.

The Union will require its members to perform their services for VTA when required by VTA to do so except for a refusal by VTA to abide by the terms of the arbitration or grievance procedure of this Agreement. Refusal of employees to cross a primary picket line of another employer, if approved by the Central Labor Council, shall not be cause for discipline nor construed as a violation of the Agreement.

During the term of the Agreement, VTA shall not cause or permit any lockout of any of its employees.

58. Despite this no-strike clause in the CBA, on March 7, 2025, ATU notified VTA's Board Chair that its members would strike beginning 12:01 a.m. on Monday, March 10.

59. On Monday, March 10, 2025, at approximately 12:01, ATU breached the CBA when it commenced a strike.

60. VTA has performed all obligations to ATU except those obligations VTA was prevented or excused from performing.

61. ATU's breach of the CBA was material and substantial because it has interfered with VTA's ability to carry out its business as a public transit agency and to provide all related services offered to the public.

62. ATU's breach of the CBA caused VTA to sustain monetary damages associated with the strike including loss of revenue, waste of resources, and additional costs.

63. As a public agency, VTA is not required to file a bond or undertaking when requesting injunctive relief. (Code Civ. Proc., § 529, subd. (b)(3).)

64. Through its unlawful strike activity, ATU is causing irreparable injury by interfering with VTA's ability to conduct its business and to provide essential transit and transit-related services to the community.

///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

65. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.

66. In every contract or agreement there is an implied promise of good faith and fair dealing. This implied promise means that each party will not do anything to unfairly interfere with the right of any other party to receive the benefits of the contract. Good faith means honesty of purpose without any intention to mislead or to take unfair advantage of another. Generally speaking, it means being faithful to one's duty or obligation. However, the implied promise of good faith and fair dealing cannot create obligations that are inconsistent with the terms of the contract.

67. VTA entered into the CBA with ATU for the period March 7, 2022, through March 3, 2025, and continuing from year to year thereafter.

68. Section 23 of the Agreement provides:

During the term of this Agreement, neither the Union nor its members shall call, sanction, assist, engage in any strike, slow-down or stoppage of VTA work, operations or service, or in any manner sanction, assist or engage in any restrictions or limitations of the work, operations, or service of VTA.

69. This term remains in full force and effect until the parties negotiate a successor agreement.

70. Section 25 of the Agreement provides:

SECTION 25 – DURATION OF AGREEMENT

The term of this Agreement shall begin on March 7, 2022, and continues through March 3, 2025, and from year to year thereafter.

Should either party desire to terminate this Agreement or alter it in any way, they shall give the other party written notice 90 days prior to March 3, 2025, or any subsequent March 3rd. Such notice shall state either the intent to terminate the Agreement at the end of the 90 day period or to negotiate amendments or changes stated in the notice.

The party receiving such 90 day notice shall, within 30 days prior to March 3, 2025, or any subsequent March 3rd, notify the other party in writing of its intent to terminate this Agreement or negotiate amendments or changes stated in its responding notice.

Negotiations on the amendments or changes of this Agreement shall begin no later than 15 days prior to March 3, 2025, or any subsequent March 3rd and shall continue until agreement is reached. During these negotiations, this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

Changes to this Agreement are effective the first pay period following ratification, unless otherwise agreed.

71. All the conditions required for ATU to perform its duty have occurred. VTA met its obligation to bargain in good faith with ATU for the terms of a successor contract.

72. ATU did not act in good faith because instead of continuing negotiations, it rushed to impasse in order to threaten a strike and did not engage in good faith negotiations. ATU then breached the CBA by commencing a strike on March 10, 2025, at approximately 12:01 a.m.

73. VTA has been harmed and will continue to be harmed by ATU's strike, which has prevented VTA from providing critical transportation services to thousands of customers resulting in millions of dollars in lost revenue, injury to the public, loss of the public's trust, and waste of resources.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment as follows:

74. That Defendants, their agents, employees, representatives, officers, organizers, committee persons, stewards, members, and all corporations, unincorporated associations, and natural persons acting in concert and participation with any of them, be enjoined and restrained from all strike activities while the no-strike clause in the CBA is in effect;

75. That a Temporary Restraining Order be granted, enjoining and restraining Defendants, their agents, employees, representatives, officers, organizers, committee persons, stewards, and members, and all persons acting in concert with them or any of them, until the hearing upon an Order to Show Cause, from doing or causing to be done any of the acts prayed in paragraph 1 of this prayer to be enjoined or restrained;

76. That upon the hearing of the Order to Show Cause, a Preliminary Injunction be granted restraining Defendants, their agents, employees, representatives, officers, organizers, committee persons, stewards, and members, and all persons acting in concert with them or any of them, from doing or causing to be done any of the acts or things prayed in paragraph 65 of this

1 prayer to be enjoined or restrained. For general damages incurred by VTA that were caused by
2 Defendants' strike;

3 77. For damages incurred by VTA in an amount to be determined;

4 78. For VTA's attorneys' fees for this suit;

5 79. For its cost of suit herein incurred;

6 80. For such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

7
8 Dated: March 10, 2025

ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO

9
10 By: 

11 Jenica D. Maldonado
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
13 SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION
14 AUTHORITY
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28