

ferred back to WKZO, and is at present operating concurrently the transmitters for both WKZO-TV and WJEF-FM.

All stations operate under the same set of standards and general policy. Engineering personnel at WJEF may originate a remote program for use by WKZO, and the converse is true. Approximately one-half of the Employer's national sponsors are sold on a combination rate, i. e., the price is based on the number of spot announcements, and the announcements on WJEF and WKZO are totaled together to determine the sponsor's rate. All engineers and technicians in the Employer's operations have been under the same contract and, consequently, receive the same benefits such as insurance, pension, profit-sharing plans, and bonuses, and are paid according to the same wage scale.

In view of the above facts, and on the entire record, the Board finds that the integration, interdependence, and centralized control of the Employer's operations, the history of multiplant bargaining, and the uniformity of interests, skills, and working conditions within the multiplant unit make a unit restricted to employees of the radio and television stations, WKZO and WKZO-TV, at Kalamazoo, Michigan, inappropriate. Accordingly, we shall dismiss the petition filed herein.

[The Board dismissed the petition.]

---

MESSENGER CORPORATION, PETITIONER *and* UNITED PAPERWORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO. *Case No. 13-RM-192. October 12, 1954*

### Decision and Direction

Pursuant to a stipulation for certification upon consent election executed June 11, 1954, an election was conducted on June 29, 1954, under the direction and supervision of the Regional Director for the Thirteenth Region, among certain employees of the Employer. At the close of the election, a tally of ballots was furnished each of the parties in accordance with the Board's Rules and Regulations. The tally shows that 51 valid ballots were cast for the Union, 49 valid ballots were cast against the Union, 8 ballots were challenged, and no ballots were void. No objections to the election were filed within the time provided therefor.

As the challenged ballots were sufficient in number to affect the results of the election, the Regional Director, acting pursuant to the Board's Rules and Regulations, investigated the issues raised by the challenges, and on August 19, 1954, issued his report on challenges, recommending that the challenge to 1 ballot be sustained, and that the challenges to 7 ballots be overruled. Thereafter, the Union filed exceptions to part of the Regional Director's report.

The Board has considered the Regional Director's report, the exceptions, and the entire record in the case, and hereby adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Regional Director, with the following additions:

1. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2 (6) of the Act.

2. The labor organization involved claims to represent certain employees of the Employer.

3. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer, within the meaning of Section 9 (c) (1) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

4. The following employees of the Employer constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9 (b) of the Act: All production and maintenance employees at the Employer's Auburn, Indiana, plant, including employers and diecutters, but excluding offset pressmen and letter pressmen, their assistants and helpers, job pressmen, platemakers, cameramen, office clerical employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

5. In the absence of any exception to the Regional Director's finding that Dosch and Hough are not supervisors within the meaning of the Act, and his recommendation that the challenges to their ballots therefore be overruled, we adopt this finding and recommendation.

In the absence of any exception to the Regional Director's finding that Paulen is a guard within the meaning of the Act, and his recommendation that the challenge to Paulen's ballot therefore be sustained, we also adopt this finding and recommendation.

Prior to March 13, 1953, Sellers was a supervisor in the hand finishing department, but that department was abolished on that date. On March 27, 1953, a notice was posted on the bulletin board that Sellers was to be in charge of production in the packing department and the greeting card stockroom, and that notice has never been retracted. However, Sellers has actually worked as a rank-and-file employee in the greeting card stockroom since March 30, 1953. Accordingly, we find that Sellers is not a supervisor; and we overrule the challenge to his ballot.

Sebring performs manual labor in the warehouse along with 2 other employees. He gives instructions to the 2 other employees, but such instructions are of a routine nature and do not require the use of independent judgment. We find that Sebring is not a supervisor, and we overrule the challenge to his ballot.

Kreamelmeyer is a janitor and maintenance man who spends all of his time doing manual labor. He sometimes gives instructions to another janitor and maintenance man, but such instructions are of a routine nature and do not require the use of independent judgment.

We find that Kreamelmeyer is not a supervisor, and we overrule the challenge to his ballot.

Prior to December 1953, Hughes was a supervisor. Since that time, however, she has spent all of her time doing rank-and-file work, and no one works under her supervision. We find that Hughes is not a supervisor, and we overrule the challenge to her ballot.

Ramsey is engaged in the repair of machinery in the plant. We find that he is a maintenance employee, and included in the appropriate unit. Accordingly, we overrule the challenge to his ballot.

As we have overruled the challenges to certain ballots, we shall direct that these ballots be opened and counted.

[The Board directed that the Regional Director for the Thirteenth Region shall open and count the ballots cast by Dosch, Hough, Sellers, Sebring, Kreamelmeyer, Hughes, and Ramsey and thereafter prepare and serve upon the parties to this proceeding a supplemental tally of ballots, including therein the count of said ballots.]

---

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY *and* INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL, PETITIONER. *Case No. 4-RC-2309.*  
*October 12, 1954*

### Decision and Direction of Election

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, a hearing was held before William Naimark, hearing officer. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

Upon the entire record in this case, the Board finds:

1. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act.
2. The labor organization involved claims to represent certain employees of the Employer.
3. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9 (c) (1) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.
4. The appropriate unit:

The Petitioner requests, in effect, a systemwide unit of all physical employees engaged in production and maintenance work at the Employer's electric generating stations and steam heating plants, including small groups of fringe employees designated as substation operators,<sup>1</sup> and store employees and telephone operators working at the

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 5, *infra*.