

# New Frontier Construction Co. d/b/a Clean Sweep  
 Janitorial Service and General Service Employ-  
 ees Union, Local 73, SEIU, AFL-CIO-CLC.  
 Case 33-CA-9861

October 30, 1992

DECISION AND ORDER

BY MEMBERS DEVANEY, OVIATT, AND  
 RAUDABAUGH

On July 7, 1992, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board issued a complaint and notice of hearing 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 33-RC-3733. (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 August 10, 1992, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On August 12, 1992, 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.

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 but attacks the validity of the certification on the basis of its objections 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.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. JURISDICTION

The Respondent, an Illinois corporation with an office and place of business located at Springfield, Illinois. It is engaged in the business of providing janitorial services for various office buildings. During the past 12 months, the Respondent derived gross revenues from the operation of its business valued in excess of \$500,000. In the course and conduct of its business operations, the Respondent purchased and caused to be transferred and delivered to its Springfield, Illinois facility supplies valued in excess of \$50,000 from suppliers outside the State of Illinois which were transported to said facility directly from States other than the State of Illinois. 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 on March 27, 1992, the Union was certified on April 6, 1992,<sup>1</sup> as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time janitors employed out of the Employer's Springfield, Illinois facility; but excluding professional employees, office clerical 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 April 29, 1992, the Union has requested the Respondent to bargain and, since June 4, 1992, 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.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

By refusing on and after June 4, 1992, 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 af-

<sup>1</sup> On May 20, 1992, the Board (Member Devaney, dissenting) issued an Order denying the Respondent's request for review of the Regional Director's decision to reject the Respondent's election objections as untimely.

fecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 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, New Frontier Construction Co. d/b/a Clean Sweep Janitorial Service, Springfield, Illinois, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

##### 1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with General Service Employees Union, Local 73, SEIU, AFL-CIO-CLC, 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 janitors employed out of the Employer's Springfield, Illinois facility; but excluding professional employees, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) Post at its facility in Springfield, Illinois, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>2</sup> Copies of the Notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 33, 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.

<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."

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

MEMBER DEVANEY, dissenting.

As my colleagues note at footnote 1, supra, I dissented in the underlying representation proceeding from the denial of the Respondent's request for review of the Regional Director's decision to reject the Respondent's election objections as untimely. Accordingly, I would not grant the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment and I dissent from my colleagues' decision to do so.

#### 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 General Service Employees Union, Local 73, SEIU, AFL-CIO-CLC, 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 janitors employed at our Springfield, Illinois facility; but excluding professional employees, office clerical employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

NEW FRONTIER CONSTRUCTION CO.  
D/B/A CLEAN SWEEP JANITORIAL SERVICE