

**Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. and International  
Union of Operating Engineers, Stationary  
Local No. 39, AFL-CIO. Case 32-CA-13189**

September 28, 1993

DECISION AND ORDER

BY CHAIRMAN STEPHENS AND MEMBERS  
DEVANEY AND RAUDABAUGH

On May 21, 1993, 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 32-RC-3595. (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 June 15, 1993, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support, with exhibits attached. On June 23, 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 letter and response.<sup>1</sup>

Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment

In its answer the Respondent admits its refusal to bargain, but attacks the validity of the certification on the basis of its objection to the election 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> In its response to the notice, the Respondent argued that the motion should be denied and a hearing directed on its objection to the election in the underlying representation case. In support thereof, the Respondent relies on the Ninth Circuit's recent decision in *NLRB v. Valley Bakery*, 986 F.2d 339 (1993). We disagree. The alleged threat in *Valley Bakery*, which the court believed required a hearing, is factually different from that alleged here. Indeed, the facts here are more similar to those in *Janler Plastic Mold Corp.*, 208 NLRB 167 (1974), threats that the *Valley Bakery* court found "might indeed be labeled illogical" and which the court distinguished in its decision.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. JURISDICTION

The Respondent, a Delaware corporation, with an office and place of business in Santa Clara, California, has been engaged in the business of the independent testing of various products in the interest of public safety.

During the 12-month period preceding issuance of the complaint, the Respondent, in conducting its business operations, performed services valued in excess of \$50,000 for customers in states other than the State of California. 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 October 29, 1992, the Union was certified on February 17, 1993, as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time maintenance and plant clerical employees and telecommunications specialist, employed by the Respondent in the Maintenance Group, Plant Department at its 1655 Scott Boulevard, Santa Clara, California location; excluding all other employees, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

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

B. *Refusal to Bargain*

Since about April 16, 1993, the Union has requested the Respondent to bargain and, since about April 22, 1993, 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 April 22, 1993, 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 Sections 8(a)(5) and (1) and 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

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 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, Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., Santa Clara, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with International Union of Operating Engineers, Stationary Local No. 39, 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 full-time and regular part-time maintenance and plant clerical employees and telecommunications specialist, employed by the Respondent in the Maintenance Group, Plant Department at its 1655 Scott Boulevard, Santa Clara, California location; excluding all other employees, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

(b) Post at its facility in Santa Clara, California, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>2</sup>

<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."

Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 32, 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 International Union of Operating Engineers, Stationary Local No. 39, 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:

All full-time and regular part-time maintenance and plant clerical employees and telecommunications specialist, employed by us in our Maintenance Group, Plant Department at our 1655 Scott Boulevard, Santa Clara, California location; excluding all other employees, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

UNDERWRITERS LABORATORIES, INC.