

**Zeiglers Refuse Collectors, Inc. and Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 430, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America. Case 4-CA-10610**

April 16, 1980

**DECISION AND ORDER**

**BY CHAIRMAN FANNING AND MEMBERS  
JENKINS AND TRUESDALE**

Upon a charge filed on November 5, 1979, by Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 430, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, herein called the Union, and duly served on Zeiglers Refuse Collectors, Inc., herein called Respondent, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, by the Regional Director for Region 4, issued a complaint and notice of hearing on November 21, 1979, against Respondent, alleging that Respondent had engaged in and was engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Copies of the charge and complaint and notice of hearing before an administrative law judge were duly served on the parties to this proceeding.

With respect to the unfair labor practices, the complaint alleges in substance that on September 27, 1979, following a Board election in Case 4-RC-13292 the Union was duly certified as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of Respondent's employees in the unit found appropriate;<sup>1</sup> and that, commencing on or about October 23, 1979, and at all times thereafter, Respondent has refused, and continues to date to refuse, to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative, although the Union has requested and is requesting it to do so. On November 30, 1979, Respondent filed its answer to the complaint admitting in part, and denying in part, the allegations in the complaint.

On December 26, 1979, counsel for the General Counsel filed directly with the Board a Motion for Summary Judgment and for Issuance of Board Decision and Order. On January 4, 1980, Respondent filed an "Opposition to General Counsel's Motion

<sup>1</sup> Official notice is taken of the Board's Decision and Certification of Representatives, 245 NLRB No. 60 (1979), and the record in the representation proceeding, Case 4-RC-13292, as the term "record" is defined in Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended. See *LTV Electrosystems, Inc.*, 166 NLRB 938 (1967), enfd. 388 F.2d 683 (4th Cir. 1968); *Golden Age Beverage Co.*, 167 NLRB 151 (1967), enfd. 415 F.2d 26 (5th Cir. 1969); *Intertype Co. v. Penello*, 269 F.Supp. 573 (D.C.Va. 1967); *Follett Corp.*, 164 NLRB 378 (1967), enfd. 397 F.2d 91 (7th Cir. 1968); Sec. 9(d) of the NLRA, as amended.

for Summary Judgment and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment" and a memorandum in support thereof. Subsequently, on January 8, 1980, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice To Show Cause why the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment should not be granted.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the Board makes the following:

**Ruling on the Motion for Summary Judgment**

In its answer to the complaint, its opposition to General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment, and its Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment, Respondent contests the Board's certification of the Union. The General Counsel argues that all material issues have been previously decided and there are no litigable issues of fact requiring a hearing. We agree with the General Counsel.

Review of the record herein, including that in Case 4-RC-13292, establishes that, pursuant to a Stipulation for Certification Upon Consent Election, an election was held on September 15, 1978, with 16 voting for and 14 against the Petitioner with no challenged ballots. Respondent timely filed four objections to conduct affecting the results of the election. The Regional Director directed a hearing on Objections 1 and 2 which alleged that union supporters threatened other employees with physical and economic harm and he recommended that Objections 3 and 4 be overruled. On January 22, 1979, the Hearing Officer filed his report recommending that the election be set aside and that a second election be directed because threats by rank-and-file employees created a general atmosphere of fear and reprisal which warranted setting aside the election.

On September 27, 1979, the Board issued a Decision and Certification of Representative, *supra*, footnote 1, which reversed the Hearing Officer and found the allegedly objectionable incidents did not relate directly to the election vote or create a general atmosphere of fear and confusion. In so finding the Board noted that the Hearing Officer had found only "minimal" evidence connecting in any way the campaign incidents with the Petitioner.

It is well settled that in the absence of newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence or special circumstances a respondent in a proceeding alleging a violation of Section 8(a)(5) is not entitled

to relitigate issues which were or could have been litigated in a prior representation proceeding.<sup>2</sup>

All issues raised by Respondent in this proceeding were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding, and Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege that any special circumstances exist herein which would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that Respondent has not raised any issue which is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment, and deny Respondent's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the basis of the entire record, the Board makes the following:

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

##### I. THE BUSINESS OF RESPONDENT

Respondent is a Pennsylvania corporation engaged in the business of collecting residential and commercial refuse from its York, Pennsylvania, facility. During the past 12 months, Respondent purchased and received goods and materials in excess of \$50,000 directly from points located outside the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

We find, on the basis of the foregoing, that Respondent is, and has been at all times material herein, an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act, and that it will effectuate the policies of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.

##### II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 430, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

##### III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

###### A. *The Representation Proceeding*

###### 1. The unit

The following employees of Respondent constitute a unit appropriate for collective-bargaining purposes within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All rear load drivers and loaders employed at the Employer's Rear Load Division located at 1020 N. Hartley Street, York, Pennsylvania;

but excluding all front end and roll off drivers, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

###### 2. The certification

On September 15, 1978, a majority of the employees of Respondent in said unit, in a secret-ballot election conducted under the supervision of the Regional Director for Region 4 designated the Union as their representative for the purpose of collective bargaining with Respondent. The Union was certified as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in said unit on September 27, 1979, and the Union continues to be such exclusive representative within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

###### B. *The Request To Bargain and Respondent's Refusal*

Commencing on or about October 23, 1979, and at all times thereafter, the Union has requested Respondent to bargain collectively with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of all the employees in the above-described unit. Commencing on or about October 23, 1979, and continuing at all times thereafter to date, Respondent has refused, and continues to refuse, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining of all employees in said unit.

Accordingly, we find that Respondent has, since October 23, 1979, and at all times thereafter, refused to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the appropriate unit, and that, by such refusal, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

##### IV. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of Respondent set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with its operations described in section I, above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

##### V. THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order that it cease and desist therefrom, and, upon request, bargain collectively with the Union

<sup>2</sup> See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. N.L.R.B.*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941); Rules and Regulations of the Board, Secs. 102.67(f) and 102.69(c).

as the exclusive representative of all employees in the appropriate unit, and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

In order to insure that the employees in the appropriate unit will be accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of certification as beginning on the date Respondent commences to bargain in good faith with the Union as the recognized bargaining representative in the appropriate unit. See *Mar-Jac Poultry Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Commerce Company d/b/a Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), enfd. 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), cert. denied 379 U.S. 817; *Burnett Construction Company*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), enfd. 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

The Board, upon the basis of the foregoing facts and the entire record, makes the following:

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Zeiglers Refuse Collectors, Inc., is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

2. Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 430, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. All rear road drivers and loaders employed at the Employer's Rear Load Division located at 1020 N. Hartley Street, York, Pennsylvania; but excluding all front end and roll off drivers, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act, constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act.

4. Since September 27, 1979, the above-named labor organization has been and now is the certified and exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

5. By refusing on or about October 23, 1979, and at all times thereafter, to bargain collectively with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees of Respondent in the appropriate unit, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) of the Act.

6. By the aforesaid refusal to bargain, Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing, employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act, and thereby has en-

gaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

7. The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

#### ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the Respondent, Zeiglers Refuse Collectors, Inc., York, Pennsylvania, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Refusing to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 430, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, as the exclusive bargaining representative of its employees in the following appropriate unit:

All rear load drivers and loaders employed at the Employer's Rear Load Division located at 1020 N. Hartley Street, York, Pennsylvania; but excluding all front end and roll off drivers, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action which the Board finds will effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Upon request, bargain with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

(b) Post at Respondent's York, Pennsylvania, office copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>3</sup> Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 4, after being duly signed by Respondent's representative, shall be posted by Respondent immediately upon receipt thereof, and be maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily

<sup>3</sup> In the event that this Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted By Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director for Region 4, in writing, within 20 days from the date of this Order, what steps have been taken to comply herewith.

#### APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES  
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with Chauffeurs, Teamsters, and Helpers Local Union No. 430, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, as the ex-

clusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit described below.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, upon request, bargain with the above-named Union, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit described below, with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. The bargaining unit is:

All rear load drivers and loaders employed at the Employer's Rear Load Division located at 1020 N. Hartley Street, York, Pennsylvania; but excluding all front end and roll off drivers, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

ZEIGLERS REFUSE COLLECTORS, INC.