

Williams-Bungart Electric Company and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 124, AFL-CIO. Case 17-CA-16419

February 18, 1993

DECISION AND ORDER

BY MEMBERS DEVANEY, OVIATT, AND
RAUDABAUGH

On November 25, 1992, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board issued a complaint 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 17-RC-10749. (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 its answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations in the complaint.

On December 28, 1992, the General Counsel filed a Motion to Transfer Proceeding to the Board and for Summary Judgment. On January 4, 1993, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed a response.¹

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 the Respondent admits its refusal to bargain and to furnish information that is relevant and necessary to the Union's role as bargaining representative, but attacks the validity of the certification. In doing so the Respondent relies on its challenge to the Board's decision on the showing of interest and on its objections to the election.

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*

¹ In addition to its response, the Respondent also filed a Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment in which it argued that its response "establishes that there is no issue of material fact to be taken to hearing and that Respondent is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Because, for the reasons stated, we grant the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment, the Respondent's cross-motion is denied.

Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941). There are no factual issues regarding the Union's request for information because the Respondent admitted that it refused to furnish the information. Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. JURISDICTION

The Respondent, a corporation with an office and place of business in Independence, Missouri, has been engaged in the construction business as an electrical contractor. During the 12-month period ending November 30, 1992, the Respondent, in conducting its business operations purchased and received at its Independence, Missouri facility goods valued in excess of \$50,000 directly from points outside the State of Missouri and during the same period provided services valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to customers outside the State of Missouri. We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(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 May 18, 1992, the Union was certified on September 10, 1992, as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time electrical construction workers employed by Respondent from its facility located at 11403 East Truman Road, Independence, Missouri, EXCLUDING all other employees, truck driver, office clerical 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*

Since September 17 and November 10, 1992, respectively, the Union has requested the Respondent to furnish information and to bargain, and since September 24 and November 16, 1992, respectively, the Respondent has refused. We find that these refusals constitute unlawful refusals to bargain in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

By refusing on and after November 16, 1992, to bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the appropriate

unit and to furnish the Union requested information, 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.²

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. We also shall order the Respondent to furnish the Union the information requested.

To ensure that the employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by 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, Williams-Bungart Electric Company, Independence, Missouri, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 124, AFL-CIO as the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit and refusing to furnish the Union information that is relevant and necessary to its role as the exclusive bargaining representative of the unit employees.

(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 full-time and regular part-time electrical construction workers employed by Respondent from

²Included within the request for information was a request for employee "social security or employee numbers." The Board has previously held that social security numbers are not presumptively relevant. Accordingly, in the absence of a showing here of their potential or probable relevance, we dismiss the allegation concerning the failure to produce social security numbers. *Sea-Jet Trucking Corp.*, 304 NLRB 67 (1991).

its facility located at 11403 East Truman Road, Independence, Missouri, EXCLUDING all other employees, truck driver, office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) On request, furnish the Union information that is relevant and necessary to its role as the exclusive representative of the unit employees.

(c) Post at its facility in Independence, Missouri, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."³ Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 17, 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.

(d) 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 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 124, AFL-CIO as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit, and WE WILL NOT refuse to furnish the Union information that is relevant and necessary to its role as the exclusive bargaining representative of the unit employees.

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:

All full-time and regular part-time electrical construction workers employed by us from our facility located at 11403 East Truman Road, Independ-

³If 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."

ence, Missouri, EXCLUDING all other employees,
truck driver, office clerical employees, profes-

sional employees, guards and supervisors as de-
fined in the Act.

WILLIAMS-BUNGART ELECTRIC COM-
PANY