



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Contents

Hot Topics	2
Video Suggestions	9
Ethical Dilemma	14
Teaching Tips	17
Chapter Key	18

Dear Professor,

I hope your fall semester is off to a great start! Welcome to McGraw-Hill Education's September 2019 issue of Proceedings, a newsletter designed specifically with you, the Business Law educator, in mind. Volume 11, Issue 2 of Proceedings incorporates "hot topics" in business law, video suggestions, an ethical dilemma, teaching tips, and a "chapter key" cross-referencing the September 2019 newsletter topics with the various McGraw-Hill Education business law textbooks.

You will find a wide range of topics/issues in this publication, including:

1. A recent Florida criminal court verdict involving Florida's "stand your ground" law;
2. A federal criminal case involving a former Veteran's Affairs pathologist fired for being intoxicated on the job;
3. Puerto Rican health care workers who claim that supervisors at a Florida clinic warned them to stop speaking Spanish among themselves at work or they would be fired;
4. Videos related to a) Walmart Inc.'s lawsuit against Tesla Inc. for negligence after sustaining repeated solar system fires and b) a federal indictment of eighty (80) people in a \$6 million fraud and money laundering scheme;
5. An "ethical dilemma" related to San Francisco International Airport's recent ban of the purchase of plastic water bottles as part of its effort to become the world's first zero-waste airport by 2021; and
6. "Teaching tips" related to Article 1 ("Michael Drejka, Who Invoked 'Stand Your Ground' Defense in Shooting of Unarmed Man, Guilty of Manslaughter") and Article 3 ("Florida Bosses Told Puerto Rican Medical Staffers: Speak English or Be Fired, Workers Say") of the newsletter.

Here's to a great fall semester!

Jeffrey D. Penley, J.D.
Senior Professor of Business Law and Ethics
Catawba Valley Community College
Hickory, North Carolina



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Of Special Interest

This section of the newsletter covers three (3) topics:

1) A recent Florida criminal court verdict involving Florida's "stand your ground" law;

2) A federal criminal case involving a former Veteran's Affairs pathologist fired for being intoxicated on the job; and

3) Puerto Rican health care workers who claim that supervisors at a Florida clinic warned them to stop speaking Spanish among themselves at work or they would be fired.

Hot Topics in Business Law

Article 1: "Michael Drejka, Who Invoked 'Stand Your Ground' Defense in Shooting of Unarmed Man, Guilty of Manslaughter"

https://abcnews.go.com/US/michael-drejka-told-police-shooting-victim-stepped-contrary/story?id=65121107&cid=clicksource_4380645_null_hero_hed

Note: In addition to the article, please see the video included at the above-referenced internet address.

According to the article, a Florida jury deliberated for just six hours before finding a man guilty of manslaughter in the 2018 killing of an unarmed father he shot in front of his family in a dispute over a handicap parking space.

Michael Drejka had argued he acted in self-defense, and initially invoked the controversial "stand your ground" law that earned widespread attention during the trial of Neighborhood Watch volunteer George Zimmerman in 2013 killing of African American teenager Trayvon Martin.

The jury in the Drejka trial came to its guilty decision recently after less than a full day of deliberation.

Drejka showed no emotion in court as the verdict was read. He will return to court for sentencing on October 10.

Just hours after gunning down Markeis McGlockton, Drejka told detectives he opened fire on July 19, 2018, when the unarmed man shoved him to the ground outside a Circle A store in Clearwater and took one step toward him, a scenario the jury apparently rejected after viewing security video multiple times that showed the victim step back when he saw Drejka pull a firearm.

"We are incredibly grateful and thankful to the prosecution," McGlockton family attorney Michelle Rayner said following the verdict. "We are grateful to the jurors of this case that they saw what we saw and I'm so proud and honored to stand here with Markeis' family. It has been the honor of my life."

Benjamin Crump, another attorney representing the McGlockton family, alleged that race played a role in the fatal shooting of the a 28-year-old African American.

"Markeis McGlockton was needlessly and wrongfully killed by this parking lot vigilante," Crump said in a statement. "The jury in this case sent a crystal-



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



clear message – violent racism has no place in American society. Today’s verdict marks a victory over stand your ground.”

Bryant Camareno, an attorney for Drejka, who is white, told the jury during his opening statement that the case was "not about race" and prosecutors did not present evidence to the contrary.

Drejka, who had a permit to carry a concealed weapon when he shot McGlockton, initially invoked Florida's so-called "stand your ground" self-defense law, which went into effect in 2005. It allowed people to use lethal force if they consider their lives to be in imminent jeopardy.

But Drejka and his attorneys scrapped that argument in favor of a plain self-defense case.

The verdict came a day after prosecutors played the jury a video of the lengthy interrogation of Drejka by Pinellas County Sheriff's Office detectives.

"What's going through my mind is he's coming after me again. I was thinking he's going to finish what he started," Drejka told detectives just hours after the shooting, according to the interrogation video.

McGlockton's father, Michael, said the guilty verdict provided relief to his family and gave them a measure of justice and closure on the tragedy, which prompted several community protests before Bernie McCabe, the state attorney for Pinellas County, announced his decision on Aug. 14 to charge Drejka with manslaughter.

"It's been well over a year since we've been dealing with this matter and I can safely say my family can rest now," Michael McGlockton said Friday. "Now we can start putting the pieces back together and move on."

Drejka told detectives that after the victim "blindsided me out of nowhere" and "tackled" him to the ground outside the Circle A store, he drew his Glock pistol from his holster as McGlockton took a step toward him.

"He barely took the second step before I pulled the trigger," Drejka told detectives George Moffett and Richard Redman, according to the video.

He said that from his position on the ground, he never saw McGlockton's face or hands before he fired.

"I could see his legs. I know he was a black guy, that's all," he told the detectives, according to the video.

He said McGlockton never said a word to him and he didn't say anything to him before he shot him. "If he hadn't twitched, I would have never pulled the trigger," Drejka had said. "The feet said he was coming toward me and so did the hips."



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Video footage from a security camera in front of the Circle A that captured the July 19, 2018, fatal shooting appears to contradict what Drejka told the detectives.

The security video played multiple times for the six-member jury showed Drejka apparently arguing with McGlockton's girlfriend, Britany Jacobs, over why she was parked in a handicap space when McGlockton came out of the store and shoved Drejka to the ground. In a split second, Drejka pulled his gun and fired as McGlockton seemed to be stepping away from McGlockton, according to the security video.

During the interrogation, which Drejka submitted to after waiving his Miranda rights to remain silent, Det. Moffett challenged Drejka's recollection of how the shooting transpired.

"What if I tell you I looked at the video and he took a step back?" Moffett asked Drejka. Drejka responded, "I'd disagree."

During the interrogation, which occurred almost six hours after the shooting, Drejka explained that he has a "pet peeve" about people parking in handicap spaces despite not being disabled himself. He said that when he saw Jacobs sitting in a car in the handicap space, he examined the front and rear of her car to see if it had a disabled person parking permit.

"I said, 'It's not very polite to park there when there's other people that need to use this,'" Drejka said he told Jacobs, according to the interrogation video. "She says, 'Is it affecting you directly?'" I said, "If my mother-in-law rolls in, yes it will."

Jacobs testified that Drejka was yelling and cursing at her for parking in the handicapped spot. She said she was inside the car with her two younger children, an infant and a 3-year-old, and that Drejka "scared" her.

"He was more angry and aggressive. He was yelling and pointing and telling me where I should park," Jacobs testified. "I just wanted this man to leave me alone, just leave me and my babies alone."

During the interrogation, Moffett asked Drejka why he didn't call law enforcement when he saw Jacobs in the handicap spot.

"Wouldn't you think it would be better instead of putting yourself in that type of circumstance that could escalate?" he asked.

Drejka responded, "Why bother you with stupid things like that?" He said by the time law enforcement arrived, the person he complained about would have already left the scene, adding, "They always do."

"When I just say something to a person about being parked there, I don't expect it to go where it went," Drejka told the detectives.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Moffett pressed him, asking if he was concerned about prompting a violent confrontation when he previously complained about people parking in handicap spaces.

Drejka answered, "That's why I take precautions. I'm a very careful person. I have a (concealed weapon) permit."

Near the end of the interrogation, Moffett informed Drejka that McGlockton had died.

"Thanks for telling me," Drejka said.

Discussion Questions

1. Describe Florida's "stand your ground" law.

As the article indicates, Florida's "stand your ground" law, which went into effect in 2005, is a law that recognizes the right of self-defense. It allows people to use lethal force if they consider their lives to be in imminent jeopardy.

2. How, if at all, is Florida's "stand your ground" law distinguishable from self-defense?

Although self-defense allows an individual to counter the aggression of others, even if such defense requires the use of lethal force, the traditional interpretation of self-defense includes an obligation of retreat if it is feasible. Florida's "stand your ground" law does not include an obligation of retreat, even if retreat is possible.

3. In your reasoned opinion, properly exercise his "stand your ground" right? Did he properly exercise self-defense? Explain your response.

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. As indicated in the article, video footage from a security camera in front of the convenience store that captured the fatal shooting appears to contradict what the defendant, Michael Drejka, told detectives.

Article 2: "Ex-VA Doctor Who Was Fired for Being Drunk on Job Charged with Manslaughter in 3 Veterans' Deaths"

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2019/08/21/ex-veterans-affairs-doctor-arkansas-faces-3-manslaughter-charges/2069837001/>

According to the article, a former Veterans Affairs pathologist fired for being intoxicated on the job was charged with three counts of involuntary manslaughter in connection with "incorrect and misleading diagnoses" he made, federal prosecutors in Arkansas said recently.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Robert Morris Levy was indicted by a federal grand jury and faces additional charges of fraud and making false statements. Prosecutors said he was in custody.

Levy not only lied about his alcohol use and manipulated mandatory alcohol and drug tests, but he also falsified patient records that ultimately caused the veterans' deaths, a federal investigation found.

"These charges send a clear signal that anyone entrusted with the care of veterans will be held accountable for placing them at risk by working while impaired or through other misconduct," VA inspector general Michael Missal said in statement.

For three patients, Levy entered "incorrect and misleading diagnoses," and in two of those cases, he falsely stated that a second pathologist confirmed a diagnosis he had made, investigators said. Levy worked as the chief of pathology at the Veterans Health Care System of the Ozarks, a VA hospital in Fayetteville, Arkansas, from 2005 until he was fired in 2018.

Levy pleaded not guilty at a hearing recently and had not obtained counsel to represent him, prosecutors said.

Prosecutors said an administrative review began in 2015 after Levy was accused of being drunk on the job, which he denied. In 2016, a drug test found that Levy was at work with alcohol in his system, which he acknowledged.

Levy was removed from work and entered a rehab program. When the program ended, he agreed to abstain from alcohol and take random drug screenings in order to return to the VA hospital, prosecutors said.

However, investigators found that in June 2017, Levy began using 2-methyl-2-butanol (2M-2B), which "enables a person to achieve a state of intoxication but is not detectable in routine drug and alcohol testing methodology," prosecutors said.

He used the chemical 12 times and hid it from the VA hospital, prosecutors said. He faces up to 524 years in prison and \$7.75 million in fines.

Discussion Questions

1. Define involuntary manslaughter.

Involuntary manslaughter is usually defined as the unlawful killing of another human being without malice aforethought. It does not involve intent; instead, it involves criminal negligence or recklessness resulting in the death of another human being.

2. What is a grand jury indictment?



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



A grand jury is typically convened to consider evidence to determine whether the prosecution should pursue charges against a criminal suspect. If the grand jury supports indictment, that is an indication that the prosecution's evidence supports the belief that the defendant committed a crime.

3. Is the VA potentially liable for the deaths that resulted in this case? Why or why not?

Negligence in hiring and negligent retention are tort theories that support a defendant employer's liability for the wrongful action(s) of the defendant employee. The ultimate question in terms of employer liability in such a case is whether the defendant employer: a) failed to satisfy a duty of care owed to patients when it hired the defendant employee; and/or 2) failed to satisfy a duty of care owed to patients by allowing the defendant employee to remain employed. These are fact-specific questions that are within the province of the jury to answer.

Article 3: "Florida Bosses Told Puerto Rican Medical Staffers: Speak English or Be Fired, Workers Say"

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2019/08/20/puerto-rica-women-florida-health-department-told-speak-english/2059290001/>

According to the article, seven Puerto Rican health care workers say supervisors at a Florida government-run clinic warned them to stop speaking Spanish among themselves or they would get fired.

The women work at the Florida Health Department clinic in Haines City.

A recent statement from the community group La Mesa Boricua de Florida says the group filed a human resources complaint and wrote a letter to the Florida Department of Health.

The workers say the job required they be bilingual because of the Hispanic patients.

Nurse Mairyli Miranda says she and her coworkers speak in English with non-Spanish-speaking patients and staff but choose their native language to talk to one another.

The health department did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission states English-only rules may violate federal laws unless they are "justified by business necessity."

Discussion Questions

1. Explain how, if at all, the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies to this case.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is landmark federal legislation prohibiting workplace discrimination based on race, gender, national origin, culture, or religion. In the subject case, the



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



question is whether the defendant employer discriminated based on race, national origin or culture if it threatened to fire workers should they continue to speak Spanish among themselves.

2. Are there any circumstances that would legally justify an “English-only” workplace communication rule?

Obviously, an employer can require its employees to communicate in English with co-workers, customers, suppliers, etc. if such communication is necessary. A blanket “English-only” workplace rule, however, does not recognize the fact that in some instances, communication in English might not be necessary for the normal performance of a particular job, or the success of the organization as a whole. For example, if two workers who speak Spanish as their primary language choose to speak Spanish while on break, how would that in any way detract from the performance of their jobs, or the overall success of the organization?

3. In the context of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, define “business necessity.”

Business necessity is a potential defense to a Civil Rights Act discrimination claim. It is an act or a requirement reasonably necessary for the performance of a particular job, or the success of the organization as a whole. For example, hiring a female actress to perform a female lead role in a major motion picture would be an example of business necessity; hiring a female-only flight attendant staff, however, would not be a business necessity.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Video Suggestions

Video 1: “Walmart Sues Tesla for Negligence after Repeated Solar System Fires”

<https://www.aol.com/article/finance/2019/08/21/walmart-sues-tesla-for-negligence-after-repeated-solar-system-fires/23798560/>

Note: In addition to the video, please also see the following article included at the above-referenced internet address:

“Walmart Sues Tesla for Negligence after Repeated Solar System Fires”

According to the article, Walmart Inc recently sued Tesla Inc, accusing it of "widespread negligence" that led to repeated fires of its solar systems and asking a court to force Tesla to remove solar panels from more than 240 of its United States stores.

Solar energy systems installed and maintained by the electric car maker were responsible for fires at seven locations, with dozens showing hazardous problems such as loose wiring and "hot spots" on panels, according to court papers filed in New York State Supreme Court.

The lawsuit accuses Tesla of having untrained workers putting up shoddy installations and showing "utter incompetence or callousness, or both," court papers said.

The lawsuit is the latest blow to Tesla's struggling solar business, which it acquired through its \$2.6 billion purchase of SolarCity in 2016. Quarterly installations have plummeted more than 85 percent since the deal, as Tesla has cut its solar panel sales force and ended a distribution deal with Home Depot Inc.

The fires destroyed significant amounts of store merchandise and required substantial repairs, totaling millions of dollars in losses, Walmart said in the lawsuit.

In addition, inspections of the retailer's other Tesla-owned solar installations "displayed troubling problems that were indicative of widespread negligence," the lawsuit said.

As of November 2018, at least seven Walmart stores, including in Denton, Maryland and Beavercreek, Ohio, had experienced fires due to Tesla's solar



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



systems, according to the lawsuit. One of the fires happened months after the system was de-energized, Walmart said.

The suit argues that inadequate inspections by Tesla have created a safety hazard for Walmart customers and employees.

Walmart became a SolarCity customer in 2010 and over the next six years fitted 244 of its store rooftops with panels in a bid to improve its image as an environmentally aware company and to lower its energy costs. In the lawsuit, it asks for the court to require Tesla to remove all its systems from Walmart stores, which are now all de-energized.

Walmart has a goal of sourcing 35 percent of its electricity from renewables by 2020. The retailer was a major customer for SolarCity, which added both residential and commercial installations at a rapid clip while taking on significant debt.

In the lawsuit, Walmart accused SolarCity of having "an ill-considered business model that required it to install solar panel systems haphazardly and as quickly as possible in order to turn a profit, and the contractors and subcontractors who performed the original installation work had not been properly hired, trained, and supervised."

Under the terms of its solar energy contracts, SolarCity, and then Tesla, was required to install, maintain and operate the panel systems, according to the lawsuit.

In July, Walmart gave Tesla 30 days to provide analyzes of the root causes of the fires, compensate the retailer for damages to its stores and demonstrate an overhaul of its operations, among other measures. As of August 15, Tesla "still had not taken any reasonable steps toward curing its breaches," the lawsuit said.

Three days later, on August 18, Tesla Chief Executive Elon Musk announced the re-launch of the company's solar business that allows customers to install solar panels without a long-term contract.

"It's like having a money printer on your roof," Musk wrote on Twitter.

Shares of the California-based company lost about 1.65% in extended trading.

The case is Walmart Inc vs Tesla Energy Operations, New York State Supreme Court, New York County.

Discussion Questions

1. Define negligence.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Negligence is the failure to do what a reasonable person would do under the same or similar circumstances. In order to prove that a defendant was negligent, the plaintiff must prove, by the greater weight of the evidence, four (4) elements: (1) the defendant owed a duty of care to the plaintiff; (2) the defendant failed to satisfy the duty of care; (3) the defendant caused the plaintiff harm; and (4) the plaintiff sustained damages (physical and/or economic) as a result.

2. If Solar City installed solar panels for Walmart before Tesla acquired it, would Tesla be legally responsible for those panels if they were defective, and/or if they were negligently installed?

Tesla would be responsible for such damages. In cases where the acquired firm (in this case, Solar City) was negligent, the acquiring firm (in this case, Tesla) is responsible. When an acquisition takes place (i.e., when one company absorbs another company), the acquiring firm assumes both the assets and the liabilities of the acquired firm.

3. In your reasoned opinion, do the facts included in the article support a conclusion of negligence? Why or why not?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. Obviously, if the case does not settle, it will be within the province of the jury to determine whether the facts support a conclusion of negligence. In your author's opinion, if the facts are as Walmart has represented—more specifically, that the solar panels caught fire (even in one instance months after the system was de-energized)—that is strong evidence of negligence, perhaps even rising to the level of negligence per se.

Video 2: “One of the Largest Cases of Its Kind’: Feds Indict 80 People in \$6 Million Fraud, Money Laundering Scheme”

https://abcnews.go.com/International/largest-cases-kind-feds-indict-80-people-10/story?id=65142255&cid=clicksource_4380645_null_bsq_hed

Note: In addition to the video, please also see the following article included at the above-referenced internet address:

“One of the Largest Cases of Its Kind’: Feds Indict 80 People in \$6 Million Fraud, Money Laundering Scheme”

According to the article, United States federal prosecutors have announced a 252-count indictment charging eighty (80) people, mostly Nigerian nationals, with being part of a widespread conspiracy to steal millions of dollars through a variety of scams and then launder the money.

The federal grand jury indictment was unsealed recently after authorities arrested 14 defendants across the United States, including 11 in the Los Angeles area, according to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of California. Three other defendants were already in federal custody. Six defendants believed to be in the country are fugitives, while the dozens of remaining defendants live in other nations, mainly Nigeria.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2

U.S. Attorney Nick Hanna said the defendants allegedly used various "sophisticated" online fraud schemes to prey upon businesses, elderly individuals and people who may have been susceptible to a romance-related scam.

"We believe this is one of the largest cases of its kind in U.S. history," Hanna told reporters at a recent press conference. "We are taking a major step to disrupt these criminal networks."

Paul Delacourt, assistant director in charge of the FBI's Los Angeles field office, said the defendants defrauded victims out of at least \$6 million and attempted to steal at least another \$40 million.

Billions of dollars are lost each year through these types of frauds, according to Delacourt. In the first seven months of 2019, more than 14,000 people filed complaints with the FBI's Internet Crime Complaint Center alleging they were victims of business email compromise, or BEC, scams, reporting total losses of almost \$1.1 billion

"This crime is growing exponentially in terms of losses and victims," Delacourt told reporters at a recent press conference. "While we are happy to announce these charges today, we are not going to arrest our way out of this problem, and so we continue to educate potential victims."

The lead defendants named in the 145-page indictment are Valentine Iro, 31, and Chukwudi Christogunus Igbokwe, 38, both Nigerian citizens who live in California and were among those arrested recently. Prosecutors allege that the pair essentially operated as "brokers of fraudulent bank accounts."

Co-conspirators based in Nigeria, the United States and other nations contacted Iro and Igbokwe for bank and money-service accounts that could receive funds fraudulently obtained from victims. Once co-conspirators convinced victims to send money under false pretenses, Iro and Igbokwe allegedly coordinated the receipt of funds and oversaw an extensive money-laundering network based out of Los Angeles, according to the indictment.

Prosecutors allege Iro and Igbokwe did all this in exchange for a cut of the stolen money.

The indictment stems from a years-long investigation led by the FBI. Iro, Igbokwe and another Nigerian defendant named in the indictment, 39-year-old Chuks Eroha, face additional charges for attempting to destroy their cellphones when the FBI executed a search warrant in 2017 at Iro's apartment in Carson, California. Iro allegedly broke his phone in half while Igbokwe and Eroha allegedly threw their phones out a window seconds after FBI agents knocked on the apartment door. Eroha is believed to have fled to Nigeria shortly after the search.

"In the days ahead," Delacourt said, "we will be working with our foreign counterparts in nine countries to apprehend 57 additional defendants."

Discussion Questions



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



1. Define fraud.

Fraud is: (1) a false statement of fact; (2) made with the intent that the listener rely on the false statement; (3) with the listener relying on the false statement; (4) the listener being harmed as a result; and (5) the listener experiencing damages (physical and/or economic) as a result.

2. What is money laundering?

Money laundering is the illegal process of concealing the origins of money obtained illegally by passing it through a complex sequence of banking transfers or commercial transactions. The overall scheme of this process returns the money to the launderer in an obscure, indirect and apparently legal way.

3. As the article indicates, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) hopes to apprehend fifty-seven (57) additional defendants currently located in foreign countries. How will the FBI be able to do so?

If the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is successful in apprehending the fifty-seven (57) additional defendants, it must do so through the process of extradition. Extradition is an act where one jurisdiction delivers a person accused or convicted of committing a crime in another jurisdiction to law enforcement. It is a cooperative law enforcement process between jurisdictions and depends on the arrangements made between them.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Ethical Dilemma

Of Special Interest

This section of the newsletter addresses San Francisco International Airport's recent ban of the purchase of plastic water bottles as part of its effort to become the world's first zero-waste airport by 2021.

“Beginning Today, You Won’t Be Able to Buy Plastic Bottles of Water at San Francisco International Airport”

<https://www.cnn.com/travel/article/sf-airport-water-bottle-ban-trnd/index.html>

According to the article, air travelers to and from the City by the Bay will now experience water in new ways.

Those wishing to hydrate at San Francisco International Airport will now have to drink from a water fountain, bring their own reusable bottle or prepare to buy an airport-approved glass or aluminum water bottle.

The airport is adding plastic water bottles to its list of restricted food service items as part of an effort to become the world's first zero-waste airport by 2021. According to the nonprofit Zero Waste Alliance, that means diverting at least 90% of waste from landfills and incinerators by recycling and composting.

Purified water, carbonated or sparkling water, mineral water and electrolyte-enhanced water are all officially banned. This means airport vendors, including vending machines, can no longer sell or provide free bottled water in a plastic bottle, a sealed box, can or other container intended primarily for single-service use and having a capacity of 1 liter or less.

Vendors will be able to sell or provide reusable recyclable aluminum, glass and certified compostable water products, according to the airport. Travelers also have the option of bringing empty disposable plastic water bottles to fill up at any of the airport's approximately 100 free water fountains and hydration stations.

Critics may wonder if the new water-bottle ban is truly green or just greenwashing -- falsely conveying that environmental responsibility has been factored into its operations. After all, the initiative does not apply to bottles of flavored drinks, such as soda, iced tea, coffee and juice.

Others, though, see the step-by-step progress made by SFO, the code for the city's airport. Earlier this year, for instance, the airport transitioned away from single-use plastic food-service ware and utensils.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Annually, SFO generates more than 28 million pounds of waste, including about 10,000 water bottles sold daily -- amounting to nearly 4 million each year, according to the airport. Consider, too, that scientists estimate a single plastic bottle takes anywhere from 450 to 1,000 years to biodegrade.

And, just as Mother Earth is finding it difficult to process all this plastic, our human bodies may be experiencing the same problem.

Every day we ingest tiny, often microscopic pieces of plastic -- "microplastics" -- with our food, beverages and with the very air we breathe. In fact, Americans eat, drink and breathe between 74,000 and 121,000 microplastic particles each year, depending on their age and sex, according to a recent study published in the journal *Environmental Science & Technology*.

If bottled water (and not tap) is our only source of hydration, annual plastic particle intake via drinking water is estimated to be approximately 75,000 for boys, 127,000 for men, 64,000 for girls and 93,000 for women, the researchers noted.

The total health impact of ingesting plastic is not yet known. But studies suggest that some particles are small enough to enter our tissues, where they can trigger an immune reaction, or release toxic substances and pollutants absorbed from the environment, including heavy metals.

Discussion Questions

1. Describe the socioeconomic view of social responsibility.

The socioeconomic view of the social responsibility of a business contrasts with the economic view of social responsibility. The economic view of social responsibility posits that the sole view of the social responsibility of business is to generate a profit, while the socioeconomic view suggests that business owes a greater obligation to its stakeholders—namely, to be a good corporate citizen.

2. In your reasoned opinion, is this overreach on the part of the city of San Francisco (which owns and operates San Francisco International Airport)? Why or why not?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary.

3. As the article indicates, critics might suggest that the new water-bottle ban is just “greenwashing,” with an organization falsely conveying that environmental responsibility has been factored into its operations even though the initiative does not apply to bottles of flavored drinks such as soda, iced tea, coffee and juice. Do you agree or disagree with this contention? Explain your response.

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. In your author’s opinion, movement toward environmental sustainability can occur in a multitude of steps, with San Francisco International Airport’s plastic water bottle ban representing one of those steps. Further, even if an organization implements an environmentally-conscious program predominantly (or even exclusively) for marketing purposes, the program is environmentally conscious nonetheless, with all its concomitant advantages.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Of Special Interest

This section of the newsletter will assist you in addressing Article 1 (“Michael Drejka, Who Invoked ‘Stand Your Ground’ Defense in Shooting of Unarmed Man, Guilty of Manslaughter”) and Article 3 (“Florida Bosses Told Puerto Rican Medical Staffers: Speak English or Be Fired, Workers Say”) of the newsletter.

Teaching Tips

Teaching Tip 1 (Related to Article 1— “Michael Drejka, Who Invoked ‘Stand Your Ground’ Defense in Shooting of Unarmed Man, Guilty of Manslaughter”): “What Does Florida’s ‘Stand Your Ground’ Law Say You Can Do?”

For a video and an article thoroughly addressing Florida’s “stand your ground” law, particularly in the context of the Michael Drejka case, please see the following internet address:

<https://www.ajc.com/news/national/what-does-florida-stand-your-ground-law-say-you-can/jpSBjlmK7L7bQdSFR45E1N/>

Teaching Tip 2 (Related to Article 3— “Florida Bosses Told Puerto Rican Medical Staffers: Speak English or Be Fired, Workers Say”): “Immigrants’ Employment Rights under Federal Anti-Discrimination Laws”

For a United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) summary of immigrants’ employment rights under federal anti-discrimination laws, including an assessment of the legality of “speak-English-only” rules, please see the following internet address:

<https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/publications/immigrants-facts.cfm>



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



Chapter Key for McGraw-Hill Education Business Law Texts:

	Hot Topics	Video Suggestions	Ethical Dilemma	Teaching Tips
Barnes et al., Law for Business	Chapters 5, 7, 24 and 25	Chapters 5 and 7	Chapter 3	Chapters 5 and 25
Bennett-Alexander & Hartman, Employment Law for Business	Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7	N/A	N/A	Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7
Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law	Chapters 7, 9, 42 and 43	Chapters 7 and 9	Chapter 2	Chapters 7, 42 and 43
Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law: The Essentials	Chapters 6, 7 and 24	Chapters 6 and 7	Chapter 2	Chapters 6 and 24
Liuzzo, Essentials of Business Law	Chapters 3, 4, 32 and 33	Chapters 3 and 4	Chapter 2	Chapters 3, 32 and 33
Langvardt et al., Business Law: The Ethical, Global, and E-Commerce Environment	Chapters 5, 7 and 51	Chapters 5 and 7	Chapter 4	Chapters 5 and 51
McAdams et al., Law, Business & Society	Chapters 4, 7 and 13	Chapters 4 and 7	Chapter 2	Chapters 4 and 13
Melvin, The Legal Environment of Business: A Managerial Approach	Chapters 9, 11, 12 and 22	Chapters 9 and 22	Chapter 5	Chapters 11, 12 and 22
Pagnattaro et al., The Legal and Regulatory Environment of Business	Chapters 10, 13, 20 and 21	Chapters 10 and 13	Chapter 2	Chapters 13, 20 and 21
Sukys, Brown, Business Law with UCC Applications	Chapters 5, 6, 22 and 23	Chapters 5 and 6	Chapter 1	Chapters 5 and 23



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

September 2019 Volume 11, Issue 2



This Newsletter Supports the Following Business Law Texts:

- Barnes et al., Law for Business, 13th Edition ©2018 (1259722325)
- Bennett-Alexander et al., Employment Law for Business, 9th Edition ©2019 (1259722333)
- Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law, 5th Edition ©2020 (1260247899)
- Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law: The Essentials, 4th Edition ©2019 (125991710X)
- Liuzzo, Essentials of Business Law, 10th Edition ©2019 (1259917134)
- Langvardt (formerly Mallor) et al., Business Law: The Ethical, Global, and E-Commerce Environment, 17th Edition ©2019 (1259917118)
- McAdams et al., Law, Business & Society, 12th Edition ©2018 (1259721884)
- Melvin, The Legal Environment of Business: A Managerial Approach, 3rd edition ©2018 (1259686205)
- Pagnattaro et al., The Legal and Regulatory Environment of Business, 18th Edition ©2019 (1259917126)
- Sukys, Business Law with UCC Applications, 15th Edition ©2020 (1259998169)

