

Chris & Pitts of Hollywood, Inc. and Los Angeles Joint Executive Board of Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, AFL-CIO. Cases 31-CA-2500 and 31-RC-1729

May 2, 1972

DECISION, ORDER, AND DIRECTION OF SECOND ELECTION

BY MEMBERS JENKINS, KENNEDY, AND PENELLO

On January 17, 1972, Trial Examiner William W. Kapell issued the attached Decision in the above-entitled consolidated proceeding. Thereafter, the Respondent filed exceptions and a supporting brief.

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.

The Board has considered the record and the Trial Examiner's Decision in the light of the exceptions and brief, and has decided to affirm the Trial Examiner's rulings, findings,¹ and conclusions² and to adopt his recommended Order³ as modified in footnote 2.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board adopts as its Order the recommended Order of the Trial Examiner and hereby orders that Respondent, Chris & Pitts of Hollywood, Inc., Los Angeles, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall take the action set forth in the Trial Examiner's recommended Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the election held in Case 31-RC-1729, on June 16, 1971, be, and it hereby is, set aside, and that the case be remanded to the Regional Director for Region 31 for the purpose of conducting a new election in the appropriate unit at such time as he deems the circumstances permit the free choice of a bargaining representative.

[Direction of Second Election and *Excelsior* footnote omitted from publication.]

¹ The Respondent has excepted to certain credibility findings made by the Trial Examiner. It is the Board's established policy not to overrule a Trial Examiner's resolutions with respect to credibility unless the clear preponderance of all of the relevant evidence convinces us that the resolutions were incorrect. *Standard Dry Wall Products, Inc.*, 91 NLRB 544, enfd. 188 F.2d 362 (C.A. 3). We have carefully examined the record and find no basis for reversing his findings.

² In adopting the Trial Examiner's conclusion that the Respondent unlawfully interrogated its employees concerning their union activity, we find it irrelevant whether employees gave untruthful or truthful responses but, instead, we rely on all the facts herein. Thus, the Respondent was aware of its employees' activities and questioned 6 of the unit's 28 employees concerning their own and other employees' concerted or union activity. One of these

employees was questioned by one supervisor twice and by another once. Another employee under questioning stated she hated the Union and the supervisor told her she was a good employee and the manager had in mind making her a headwaitress. Respondent made clear its hostility toward the Union and neither gave the employees assurance against resort to economic reprisal nor stated the purpose of the interrogation. *Farlow Rubber Supply, Inc.*, 193 NLRB No. 70 (TXD). See also *Blue Flash Express, Inc.*, 109 NLRB 591. Accordingly, in the total circumstances of this case, we find Respondent's interrogation tended to coerce its employees in the free exercise of their Section 7 rights and thereby violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

³ Member Kennedy does not find that Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act by the assurances given to employees by Lopez that Manager Morrison would stop being abusive to them.

TRIAL EXAMINER'S DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE¹

WILLIAM W. KAPPELL, Trial Examiner: Case 31-CA-2500, a proceeding under Section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, herein called the Act, was tried before me in Los Angeles, California, on November 9 and 10, 1971,² with all parties participating pursuant to due notice upon a complaint³ issued by the Acting Regional Director for Region 31 on August 20. The complaint alleges, in substance, that in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act Respondent interrogated employees concerning their union activities and the union activities of other employees; threatened employees with discharge or other economic reprisals if they became or remained members of the Union or supported it; promised employees better terms and conditions of employment to induce them to abstain from membership in or support of the Union; and gave employees the impression that their union activities were being kept under surveillance. In its duly filed answer Respondent denied engaging in any of the alleged unfair labor practices in violation of the Act.

In Case 31-RC-1729 following the filing of a petition for an election, the execution of a Stipulation for Certification Upon Consent Election, an election by secret ballot (lost by the Union), challenges to ballots sufficient in number to affect the election results, and the filing of Objections to Conduct Affecting the Results of the Election, the Board disposed of the challenges in a manner not pertinent to or relevant herein and issued an order directing a hearing to be held before a Trial Examiner for the purpose of receiving evidence concerning Objections 2 through 5 (alleged in substance as the violations in Case 31-CA-2500), and making findings of fact with recommendations to the Board as to the disposition of said issues, and that such hearing be consolidated with the hearing on the complaint in Case 31-CA-2500.

All parties were represented and were afforded opportunity to introduce evidence, to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and to file briefs. The General Counsel and Respondent have filed briefs which have been carefully considered.

Upon the entire record in these proceedings and from my observation of the witnesses, I make the following:

¹ The name of Respondent was amended at the hearing as indicated in the caption.

² All dates hereafter refer to the year 1971 unless otherwise noted.

³ Based on charges filed by Los Angeles Joint Executive Board of Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, AFL-CIO, hereinafter referred to as the Union, on June 23 and August 3 and 18, respectively.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. COMMERCE

Respondent, a California corporation, has at all times material herein been the owner and operator of a restaurant located at 5214 Sunset Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles, California, and several other restaurants in California, where it has been engaged in the business of selling food and beverages to the general public. Respondent in its normal course of business during 1970 received gross revenues in excess of \$500,000 and purchased and received in excess of \$10,000 worth of goods and supplies from suppliers located in California who, in turn, purchased and received said goods and supplies from points directly outside the State of California. Respondent admits, and I find, at all times material herein, that it has been an employer engaged in commerce and in a business affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

Respondent admits, and I find, at all times material herein, that the Union has been a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

III. THE ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. *Interrogation*

In support of violative interrogation by Respondent as alleged in the complaint, General Counsel adduced testimony by several employees that during the Union's organizing campaign Peggy Welsch, supervisor of waitresses, or Kenneth Morrison, Respondent's manager, questioned them concerning the Union. Thus, Olga Edwards, a waitress, testified that Welsch came up to her on or about April 15 and asked whether she had been approached by the Union. When Edwards replied that she had not been approached, probably because she was a suspended member, Welsch told her that Chris & Pitts was opposed to being unionized. Welsch admitted approaching Edwards about the Union, but only to verify whether she, like other waitresses who had complained, had been bothered and impeded in her work by union representatives in the restaurant.⁴ Edwards, in fact, called the Union 2 days before and had requested that a union card be sent to her home, which she had then signed. Her failure to reveal these facts is indicative of her fear of reprisal or of antagonizing management.

Anita Hatcher, another waitress, testified about the following three incidents involving interrogation: In late April, Welsch approached her and asked whether she had signed a union card. When she denied signing a card, although she had, in fact, done so, Welsch then stated that "Chris & Pitts has never been union and doesn't want to be." Welsch denied ever talking to Hatcher about the Union. On June 14, 2 days before the election, Kenneth Morrison approached her and asked how she felt about the Union. She replied that she had not made up her mind and wanted to ascertain what both sides had to offer for medical insurance. Morrison, thereupon, brought out a company pamphlet in which he pointed out several company insurance benefits and stated that he did not care for the Union's Kaiser Insurance plan. Morrison admitted approaching Hatcher and

discussing insurance plans, but claimed he did so only after noticing that she was glancing through a copy of the Company's Traveler's Insurance plan which was on display on the employees' dining table, and after asking whether she had any questions regarding the matter. He denied questioning her about the Union. On the day of the election, following a conversation in the restaurant with the Union's attorney who asked her to act as a union observer at the election, Welsch approached her and, after inquiring what the union man wanted, said, "Oops I am not supposed to ask you that." According to Welsch she observed a stranger talking to Hatcher and, believing he was a customer complaining about something, she asked Hatcher about it. Hatcher's testimony, which to a large extent was admitted, was given in a straightforward and persuasive manner and is credited.

Margie Handley, also a waitress, testified that before the election Welsch approached her and said, "Margie, I heard you signed a union card and you are for the Union." Handley replied, "Yes Peggy, I signed a union card, I feel that is my privilege." Welsch then told her, "I want you to know we don't want anything to do with the Union," and that the Union had also tried to organize one of the other Chris & Pitts restaurants and George Pelonis (general manager of all the restaurant units) "had to go out in the street and practically drag the girls in to keep the Union out." Welsch claimed that Handley approached and told her that she had signed a union card, not realizing what she had done, and that at the same time another waitress came up and said she had also signed a card. Based on the demeanor of the parties, Handley's testimony is credited.

Gretchen Gamuzzo, another waitress, testified that, in the month of May after she had been disturbed by a few incidents during the preceding week concerning which she had spoken to some of the girls, she was summoned to Morrison's office by Welsch. There, she complained about an incident the previous night involving Helene Lopez' scraping a knife across her forearm, and in general also spoke about the pressures the girls were under on the job, which had been exacerbated by the Union's organizing campaign. As she was about to leave, Welsch asked her about the Union. After she replied that she hated the Union, Welsch mentioned that she felt certain named waitresses were going to vote for the Union. When Gamuzzo agreed with her, Welsch then asked how the other waitresses were going to vote. Gamuzzo then discussed how she felt each girl she named would vote. After she completed going through the list of the waitresses, Welsch commented in confidence that she was a good waitress and that Morrison had told her he had her (Gamuzzo) in mind about making her a head waitress. Gamuzzo replied that her inexperience and youth made it unfeasible then, but that in due time she would consider it. Welsch denied talking to her about the Union and stated that she called Gamuzzo into her office to inquire about rumors to the effect that she, a good waitress, was quitting; that Gamuzzo complained about being mistreated by Lopez and was unhappy, and asked about becoming a head waitress; and that she (Welsch) commented it was premature considering her inexperience and youth. Gamuzzo's testimony was given in a very convincing and positive manner and is credited.

Ashoor Geevargis, a cook, testified that at the end of March, after being followed to the vicinity of his home by a union representative and being pressured, he signed a union card under the fictitious name of Bob Georges. Upon returning to the restaurant he asked Morrison, "what's the story about this union man," who had followed him to his home. Morrison then asked him whether he had signed a

⁴ It is noted that Welsch neither explained the purpose of her questioning to Edwards, nor did she frame her question with reference to union harassment.

union card. Geevargis replied he had not signed one, but about a half hour later he approached Morrison and admitted that he had signed a union card under the name of Bob Georges. When Morrison asked why he had signed, he replied that he did so under pressure from the union man and to get rid of him. Morrison denied participating in the alleged conversation and stated that he had happened to overhear Geevargis relating the incident to the kitchen help. Geevargis, who testified with a decided foreign accent, appeared to have difficulty expressing himself in English and at times contradicted himself, in all likelihood because he appeared not to understand some of the questions put to him. In the main, however, he impressed me as being a truthful witness and his testimony is credited. In arriving at this conclusion I have taken into consideration the fact that he was fired by Respondent and that charges brought on his behalf in that matter were dismissed.

Conclusions

In considering incidents of alleged interrogation to determine whether they are violative of the Act, it is necessary to view them in the context of employer hostility to the Union, the truthfulness of the replies as evidencing fear of reprisals, the purpose of the interrogation and whether it was explained to the employee, and whether assurances were given that no reprisals would be taken. As found above, Respondent was prying into the sentiments of its employees while expressing its opposition to the Union,⁵ some of the interrogated employees gave untrue answers, the purpose of the interrogation was not revealed, nor were any assurances given that no reprisals would be taken. Such conduct is proscribed and is in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act. See *N.L.R.B. v. Miller Redwood Company*, 407 F.2d 1366, 1368 (C.A. 9), *engf.* 164 NLRB 389, and *N.L.R.B. v. Ambrose Distributing Co.*, 358 F.2d 319, 320-321 (C.A. 9), *cert. denied* 385 U.S. 838, *engf.* 150 NLRB 1642.

B. Impressions of Union Surveillance

Handley testified, as indicated *supra*, that, in a conversation with Welsch in which she was asked whether she had signed a union card, Welsch in response to her question as to where she had heard that stated that Morrison had told her. Handley testified further that on the day before the election she asked Morrison whether it was necessary for her to come in to vote on the following day which was her day off, and that he replied if she were going to vote "no" she should come in, and that he knew how the boys in the kitchen were going to vote, but not the girls (the waitresses). Other than testifying that he was not in the restaurant on the day before the election because it was his day off, Morrison made no reference to the alleged conversation with Handley.

Conclusions

The General Counsel contends that Welsch and Morrison in their respective conversations with Handley created the impression that her union activities or those of other employees were being kept under surveillance in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act. The law is well settled that

⁵ Respondent's disclaimer of any union animus because 5 of its 11 restaurant units recognized the Union falls far short of being conclusive. Besides not having any direct bearing on the unit involved herein, Respondent may not have had any choice in recognizing the Union for those units despite its union animus.

giving employees the impression that their union activities were being kept under surveillance constitutes a violation of Section 8(a)(1) in that it could inhibit the rights of employees to pursue their union activities. Clearly, the remarks of Welsch and Morrison tended to create the impression that Respondent was keeping employees' activities for the Union under close surveillance. How Morrison received the information is not determinative of the issue. Whether or not an employer, in fact, spies upon the employees, if he creates the impression in their minds that he is keeping their union activities under surveillance, it is intimidating and as coercive as surveillance itself. I, therefore, conclude based on the above findings that Respondent's conduct constituted violations of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act. See *N.L.R.B. v. Miller Redwood Co.*, *supra*, 1368.

C. The Threats of Discharge

Geevargis testified that, about 3 weeks before he was fired on May 28, he was called to Morrison's office to discuss a promotion which he was seeking. Morrison not only refused to give him a wage increase, claiming that he was getting top salary, but also reprimanded him for going over his head, first to George Pelonis⁶ and then, when he was unavailable, to Leo Pelonis,⁷ about his requested raise. Morrison told him further that Leo Pelonis was familiar with his problem and that if George Pelonis did not want the Union he would fire everybody because he had enough people in his hand to operate the restaurant. Morrison testified that he had called Geevargis into his office because he had heard rumors to the effect that Geevargis was planning to leave Respondent and he wished to check on the matter, and that was all that was discussed.

Conclusions

The General Counsel contends that Morrison in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act conveyed a threat by George Pelonis to effect a mass discharge because of employee union activities. Even crediting Geevargis' testimony, I find that the alleged threat was neither clearly nor unequivocally made, and that it did not appear to be related to any union activities discussed in their conversation. I, therefore, conclude that the General Counsel has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent threatened a mass discharge of employees because of their union activities, and recommend that the allegations of the complaint in support of said alleged violation be dismissed.

D. Promises of Benefits to Employees

Helene Lopez, an admitted agent of Respondent and a supervisor of waitresses in the absence of Welsch, testified that two nights before the election in a conversation with Chris (Leo) Pelonis she was asked what was going on in the restaurant, which both of them understood to mean the problems with the waitresses. Lopez informed him that she had called George Pelonis on April 23 and he had promised but failed to show up to discuss the problems, that Morrison was abusing the waitresses by criticizing and yelling at them, which made it difficult for her to keep any help, and that the girls had decided to unionize. At this point Morrison was summoned and joined in the conversation. He accused Lopez of going directly to George Pelonis over his head. She admitted it stating it was because she had been unable to get any results in the matter from either Morrison

⁶ General Manager of all restaurant units.

⁷ Respondent's president.

or Welsch. Chris then reprimanded Morrison for his attitude towards the waitresses and instructed him to stop being abusive to them.

On the following day, her day off, Lopez received a telephone call from Welsch in which she was told that Chris wanted her to come to the restaurant to tell the girls about her conversation with him the preceding night, and that because of her position with Chris & Pitts she (Welsch) was not allowed to approach the girls. Pursuant to Welsch's call, Lopez came to the restaurant where Welsch took her into an office and told her that if she were asked by the girls why she came to work on her day off to tell them a new girl was coming in to be interviewed for a job; that she should "hostess" around and while doing so speak to the waitresses individually and tell them that as a result of her conversation with Chris the previous night he had assured her he would take care of their problems with Morrison; and that she should try to influence the girls to vote against the Union at the election. Chris Pelonis who had been standing near the entrance to the office then walked in and told her to do the best she could. Lopez then went out on the floor and while milling around found opportunities to tell Gaumuzzo, Hatcher, Handley, Edwards, and Cairns individually about the assurances given to her by Chris.⁸ Handley got upset and accused Lopez of trying to influence her vote. Edwards also got upset and said she did not know why Lopez was there on her day off and that Peggy had already spoken to her about the problem, to which Lopez replied that she personally was not trying to influence her vote and she was only following instructions, which was part of her job. Cairns laughed and said, "this is not going to change my vote any." Welsch testified that she told Lopez to speak to each girl to make sure they knew that Chris was going to take care of their problems with Morrison, and that Chris appeared towards the end of her conversation with Lopez and heard her talking to Lopez but that she was unable to recall whether Chris made any statement.⁹

Conclusions

As related above, Welsch's statements to the waitresses while questioning them about the Union clearly indicated Respondent's hostility to the Union. The conniving of Welsch to explain the presence of Lopez in the restaurant on her day off and the timing, just 1 day before the election, of the assurances given to the waitresses that their conditions of employment would be improved by a resolution of their difficulties with Morrison were calculated to have the effect of influencing them to vote against the Union and were undertaken with the purpose of impinging upon their freedom of choice for or against unionization. "Any such interferences, accomplished by allurements, are as much condemned by the Act as is coercion." *N.L.R.B. v. Douglas and Lomason Company*, 333 F.2d 510, 514 (C.A. 8). See also

⁸ Handley and Hatcher corroborated Lopez' testimony that they were approached by her and given the assurances of Chris concerning their difficulties with Morrison.

⁹ In a prehearing affidavit given by Lopez on July 27 she denied that Chris or Welsch told her to use her influence to get the girls to vote against the Union. In a later affidavit on August 3, she stated that the circumstances attendant to her earlier affidavit frightened her to the point of falsely stating that neither Chris nor Welsch asked her to use her influence, and that they, in fact, did ask her to do so. I find that the circumstances (several trying and upsetting visits to the offices of Respondent's labor consultant) related by her in which she made and signed her first affidavit had an unnerving effect on her and I credit her testimony, which is corroborated by her second affidavit. Furthermore, the obvious inference of her message to the waitresses was to influence them.

N.L.R.B. v. Exchange Parts Company, 375 U.S. 405, 409, where the Court stated "We have no doubt that it [Section 8(a)(1)] prohibits not only intrusive threats and promises but also conduct immediately favorable to employees which is undertaken with the expressed purpose of impinging upon their freedom of choice for or against unionization and is reasonably calculated to have that effect." I therefore conclude that Respondent through Lopez violated Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

IV. THE OBJECTIONS TO CONDUCT AFFECTING THE ELECTION RESULTS

The Union contends that the violations committed by Respondent warrant setting aside the election herein. In order to set aside an election it is necessary to establish that, during the period beginning with the filing of a representation petition and the holding of the election, the employees were subjected to influences which interfered with the exercise of a free and untrammelled choice in the election. As related above, the violations found to have occurred during this critical period consist of the interrogations of Hatcher on June 4 and 16 and the promise of benefits through Lopez to several waitresses on June 15. Although other violations were found, they were not sufficiently pinpointed with respect to the date of their occurrences so as to incontestably fall within the critical period. The Board has consistently held that conduct violative of Section 8(a)(1) *a fortiori*, interferes with the exercise of a free and untrammelled choice of an election.¹⁰ I, therefore, find merit in and sustain the Union's objections to the extent found during the critical period and recommend that the election be set aside and a new election ordered.

V. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of Respondent set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with the 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.

Upon the foregoing findings of fact, and upon the entire record, I make the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. At all times material herein, Respondent has been engaged in commerce as an employer within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

2. At all times material herein, the Union has been a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. By interrogating employees about the Union, creating an impression of surveillance of their union activities, and promising them better conditions of employment to induce them to vote against the Union, Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced its employees within the meaning, and in violation, of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

4. Except as found above, Respondent has not engaged in any unfair labor practices alleged in the complaint.

THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has engaged in unfair

¹⁰ *Oleson's Foods No. 4, Inc.*, 167 NLRB 543, 551; *Irving Air Chute Co., Inc.*, 149 NLRB 627, 629.

labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act, I shall recommend that it cease and desist therefrom and take certain affirmative action designed to effectuate the policies of the Act.

Upon the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, and upon the entire record in the case, and pursuant to Section 10(c) of the Act, I hereby issue the following recommended:¹¹

ORDER

Respondent, Chris & Pitts of Hollywood, Inc., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Interrogating employees about the Union, creating an impression of surveillance of their union activities, and promising them better conditions of employment to influence them against the Union.

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

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Post at its restaurant at 5214 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."¹² Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 31, after being duly signed by Respondent's authorized 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 posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(b) Notify the Regional Director for Region 31, in writing, within 20 days from the date of the receipt of this Decision, what steps the Respondent has taken to comply herewith.¹³

IT IS ALSO FURTHER ORDERED that the complaint be dismissed insofar as it alleges violations of the Act not specifically found.

¹¹ In the event no exceptions are filed as provided by Section 102.46 of the Rules and Regulations of the National Labor Relations Board, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order herein shall, as provided in Section 102.48 of the Rules and Regulations, be adopted by the Board and become its findings, conclusions, and order, and all objections thereto shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

¹² In the event that the Board's 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 be changed to read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

¹³ In the event that this recommended Order is adopted by the Board after exceptions have been filed, this provision shall be modified to read: "Notify the Regional Director for Region 31, in writing, within 20 days from the date of this Order, what steps the Respondent has taken to comply herewith."

APPENDIX

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

The National Labor Relations Board having found, after trial, that we violated Federal law by interfering with, restraining, or coercing our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act:

WE WILL NOT coercively question you about your union support or union activities.

WE WILL NOT create an impression of surveillance or your union activities.

WE WILL NOT promise to improve the conditions of your employment in order to influence you against the Union.

CHRIS & PITTS OF HOLLYWOOD, INC.
(Employer)

Dated _____ By _____ (Representative) _____ (Title)

This is an official notice and must not be defaced by anyone.

This notice must remain posted for 60 consecutive days from the date of posting and must not be altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

Any questions concerning this notice or compliance with its provisions may be directed to the Board's Office, Federal Building, Room 12100, 11000 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90024, Telephone 213-824-7352.