

**Aramark Uniform Services, Inc. and Truck Drivers,  
Warehousemen and Helpers Local Union No.  
512, affiliated with the International Brother-  
hood of Teamsters, AFL-CIO. Case 12-CA-  
17583**

March 20, 1996

**DECISION AND ORDER**

BY CHAIRMAN GOULD AND MEMBERS BROWNING  
AND COHEN

Pursuant to a charge filed on December 5, 1995, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board issued a complaint on January 8, 1996, alleging that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the National Labor Relations Act by refusing the Union's request to bargain following the Union's certification in Case 12-RC-7857. (Official notice is taken of the "record" in the representation proceeding as defined in the Board's Rules and Regulations, Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g); Frontier Hotel, 265 NLRB 343 (1982).) The Respondent filed an answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations in the complaint, and submitting an affirmative defense.

On February 9, 1996, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On February 13, 1996, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. On February 26, 1996, the Respondent filed a response.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

**Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment**

In its answer and response the Respondent admits its refusal to bargain with the Union, but attacks the validity of the Union's certification on the basis of the Board's disposition of a determinative challenged ballot in the representation proceeding.

All representation issues raised by the Respondent were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding. The Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege any special circumstances that would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that the Respondent has not raised any representation issue that is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941). Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In the underlying representation proceeding, Member Cohen dissented and would have remanded for a hearing and a determination whether the challenged employee had a reasonable expectation of re-

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**I. JURISDICTION**

At all material times, the Respondent, a Delaware corporation, with facilities located in various States, has been engaged in the laundry and uniform rental business, including operating a facility in Jacksonville, Florida. During the 12-month period preceding the issuance of the complaint, the Respondent, in conducting its business operations, shipped goods and provided services valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to points located outside the State of Florida.

We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act and that the Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

**II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES**

**A. The Certification**

Following the election held June 30, 1995, the Union was certified on November 21, 1995, as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All route representatives employed by the Employer at its Jacksonville, Florida, depot, including route jumpers; *excluding* all other employees including production and maintenance employees, relay drivers, plant clerical employees, front office employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

The Union continues to be the exclusive representative under Section 9(a) of the Act.

**B. Refusal to Bargain**

About November 29, 1995, the Union, by telephone, requested the Respondent to bargain, and since November 30, 1995, the Respondent has refused. We find that this refusal constitutes an unlawful refusal to bargain in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

By refusing on and after November 30, 1995, to bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the appropriate unit, the Respondent has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

turn. See his dissents in *Vanalco, Inc.*, 315 NLRB 618 (1994); and *Pepsi-Cola Co.*, 315 NLRB 1322, 1324 (1995). Accordingly, Member Cohen does not join in finding that the Respondent violated Sec. 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act by refusing to bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative of the unit employees.

## REMEDY

Having found that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order it to cease and desist, to bargain on request with the Union, and, if an understanding is reached, to embody the understanding in a signed agreement.

To ensure that the employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by the law, we shall construe the initial period of the certification as beginning the date the Respondent begins to bargain in good faith with the Union. *Mar-Jac Poultry Co.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), *enfd.* 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied* 379 U.S. 817 (1964); *Burnett Construction Co.*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), *enfd.* 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

## ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, Aramark Uniform Services, Inc., Jacksonville, Florida, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

## 1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with Truck Drivers, Warehousemen and Helpers Local Union No. 512, affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, AFL-CIO as the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

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

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

(a) On request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment, and if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement:

All route representatives employed by the Employer at its Jacksonville, Florida, depot, including route jumpers; *excluding* all other employees including production and maintenance employees, relay drivers, plant clerical employees, front office

employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) Post at its facility in Jacksonville, Florida, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>2</sup> Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 12, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director in writing within 20 days from the date of this Order what steps the Respondent has taken to comply.

## 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 has found that we violated the National Labor Relations Act and has ordered us to post and abide by this notice.

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain with Truck Drivers, Warehousemen and Helpers Local Union No. 512, affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, AFL-CIO as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

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

WE WILL, on request, bargain with the Union and put in writing and sign any agreement reached on terms and conditions of employment for our employees in the bargaining unit:

<sup>2</sup>If 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."

All route representatives employed by us at our Jacksonville, Florida, depot, including route jumpers; *excluding* all other employees including production and maintenance employees, relay drivers, plant clerical employees, front office employees,

professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

ARAMARK UNIFORM SERVICES, INC.