

1 CHRISTOPHER T. CORSON, General Counsel  
2 BILL HALLER  
3 INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS  
4 AND AEROSPACE WORKERS  
5 9000 Machinists Place  
6 Upper Marlboro, MD 20772-2687  
7 Tel: (301) 967-4500  
8 Fax: (301) 967-4594

9 DAVID A. ROSENFELD, Bar No. 058163  
10 WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD  
11 A Professional Corporation  
12 1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200  
13 Alameda, California 94501-1091  
14 Telephone 510.337.1001  
15 Fax 510.337.1023

16 Attorneys for Petitioner/Charging Party

17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
18 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

19 International Association of Machinists and 20 Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO	) Case No. 12-CA-26377 and 21 12-RC-9344
22 Petitioner/Charging Party,	) MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
23 v.	)
24 Contemporary Cars, Inc., d/b/a Mercedes-Benz 25 of Orlando.	)
26 Employer.	)

27 This Motion for Reconsideration concerns footnote 4 of the Board's Decision and Order  
28 dated August 23. In footnote 4 the Board deemed the date of the Certification "to have been issued  
as of the date of this decision."

As the Board noted however, there was a post election proceeding involving challenged  
ballots. The Regional Director as noted in footnote 3 issued a Supplemental Decision and at that  
time "the Regional Director issued a Certification of Representative."

The Board in determining that the Regional Director could properly schedule and conduct  
the election relied upon Section 102.67(b) of the Board's Rules and Regulations. Section 102.69  
(h) also deals precisely with the issue raised in footnote 4. That provision provides that the

1 Regional Director and not the Board shall issue the Certification of Representative if there are post  
2 election challenge procedures. Thus the Regional Director's issuance of the certification initially is  
3 still valid.

4 For these reasons, footnote 4 should be revised because the Certification of Representative  
5 should be deemed valid as of the date that it was issued by the Regional Director not the date  
6 several years later when the Board issued the instant decision on August 23, 2010.

7 For these reasons, this Motion for Reconsideration should be granted.

8 Dated: September 17, 2010

9  
10 WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD  
A Professional Corporation

11  
12 By: /s/David A. Rosenfeld  
DAVID A. ROSENFELD  
Attorneys for Petitioner/Charging Party

13 1/589532  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**  
(CCP 1013)

I am a citizen of the United States and an employee in the County of Alameda, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200, Alameda, California 94501-1091. On September 17, 2010, I served upon the following parties in this action:

Brian M. Herman, Esq.	NLRB Region 12
Douglas Sullenberger, Esq.	South Trust Plaza Suite 530
Fisher & Phillips LLP	201 East Kennedy Blvd
1500 Resurgens Plaza	Tampa, FL 33602-5824
945 East Paces Ferry Road	FAX: 813-228-2874
Atlanta, GA 30326	
Fax (404) 240-4249	

Steven M. Bernstein  
Fisher & Phillips LLP  
2300 SunTrust Financial Centre  
401 E. Jackson Street  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Fax (813) 769-7501

copies of the document(s) described as:

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

- BY MAIL** I placed a true copy of each document listed herein in a sealed envelope, addressed as indicated herein, and caused each such envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, to be placed in the United States mail at Alameda, California. I am readily familiar with the practice of Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing, said practice being that in the ordinary course of business, mail is deposited in the United States Postal Service the same day as it is placed for collection.
- BY FACSIMILE** I caused to be transmitted each document listed herein via the fax number(s) listed above or on the attached service list.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct. Executed at Alameda, California, on September 17, 2010.

/s/Katrina Shaw  
Katrina Shaw

*NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.*

**Contemporary Cars, Inc. d/b/a Mercedes-Benz of Orlando and International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO.**  
Cases 12-CA-26377 and 12-RC-9344

August 23, 2010

DECISION AND ORDER

BY CHAIRMAN LIEBMAN AND MEMBERS SCHAUMBER  
AND PEARCE

On August 28, 2009, the two sitting members of the Board issued a Decision and Order, which is reported at 354 NLRB No. 72.<sup>1</sup> Thereafter, the Respondent filed a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the General Counsel filed a cross-application for enforcement. On June 17, 2010, the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in *New Process Steel, L.P. v. NLRB*, 130 S.Ct. 2635, holding that under Section 3(b) of the Act, in order to exercise the delegated authority of the Board, a delegee group of at least three members must be maintained. Thereafter, the Board issued an order setting aside the above-referenced decision and order, and retained this case on its docket for further action as appropriate.

The National Labor Relations Board has consolidated these proceedings and delegated its authority in both proceedings to a three-member panel.<sup>2</sup>

This is a refusal-to-bargain case in which the Respondent is contesting the Union's certification as bargaining representative in the underlying representation proceeding. The Board's August 28, 2009 decision states that the Respondent is precluded from litigating any representation issues because, in relevant part, they were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceed-

<sup>1</sup> Effective midnight December 28, 2007, Members Liebman, Schaumber, Kirsanow, and Walsh delegated to Members Liebman, Schaumber, and Kirsanow, as a three-member group, all of the powers of the National Labor Relations Board in anticipation of the expiration of the terms of Members Kirsanow and Walsh on December 31, 2007. Thereafter, pursuant to this delegation, the two sitting members issued decisions and orders in unfair labor practice and representation cases.

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with the Board's general practice in cases remanded from the courts of appeals, and for reasons of administrative economy, the panel includes the members who participated in the original decision. Furthermore, under the Board's standard procedures applicable to all cases assigned to a panel, the Board Members not assigned to the panel had the opportunity to participate in the adjudication of this case prior to the issuance of this decision.

ings. The preelection representation proceeding resulted in a two-member decision and we do not give it preclusive effect. However, the postelection proceeding was resolved by the Regional Director and no party sought review before the Board.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, we give the postelection proceedings preclusive effect.

We have considered the preelection representation issues raised by the Respondent, and we find them without merit. Accordingly, we affirm the decision to deny the Respondent's request for review in the prior proceeding.

Having resolved the representation issues raised by the Respondent in this proceeding, we next consider the question whether the Board can rely on the results of the election. For the reasons stated below, we find that the election was properly held and the tally of ballots is a reliable expression of the employee's free choice.

As an initial matter, had the Board decided not to issue decisions during the time that the delegee group consisted of two Board Members, the Regional Director would have conducted the election as scheduled and impounded the ballots. In this regard, Section 102.67(b) of the Board's Rules and Regulations states:

The Regional Director shall schedule and conduct any election directed by the [Regional Director's] decision notwithstanding that a request for review has been filed with or granted by the Board. The filing of such a request shall not, unless otherwise ordered by the Board, operate as a stay of the election or any other action taken or directed by the Regional Director: *Provided, however,* That if a pending request for review has not been ruled upon or has been granted[,] ballots whose validity might be affected by the final Board decision shall be segregated in an appropriate manner, and all ballots shall be impounded and remain unopened pending such decision. [Emphasis in original.]

See also Casehandling Manual (Representation) Secs. 11274, 11302.1(a) (same). In such a scenario, after resolving the representation issues, we would direct that the impounded ballots be opened and counted.

Thus, it is clear that the decision of the two sitting Board Members to continue to issue decisions did not affect the outcome of the election. With or without a two-member decision on the original request for review, the election would have been conducted as scheduled.

<sup>3</sup> The postelection proceeding involved challenges to ballots affecting the results of the election. The Regional Director issued a supplemental decision directing that certain ballots be opened and counted. No party sought review of this supplemental decision. Thereafter, the ballots were opened and counted, a revised tally of ballots was prepared, and the Regional Director issued a Certification of Representative.

This result is required by Section 102.67(b) of the Board's Rules, and, under *New Process Steel*, the two sitting Board Members did not have the authority to issue an order directing otherwise. Since the timing of the election was not affected by the issuance of a two-member decision on the request for review, we find that the decision of the Regional Director to open and count the ballots was, at worst, harmless error that did not affect the tally of ballots. Similarly, we find that the Regional Director's Certification of Representative based on that tally was valid.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, inasmuch as there is no valid basis for challenging the results of the election or the Regional Director's Certification of Representative, we will rule on the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment.

#### Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment

The Respondent admitted its refusal to bargain prior to the decision in *New Process Steel*, but contests the validity of the Union's certification. Having found no merit in the Respondent's challenges to the representation proceedings, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment and, to the extent consistent herewith, adopt the findings of fact, conclusions of law, remedy, and order set forth in

<sup>4</sup> There is no question that a majority of valid ballots was cast for the Union. To the extent that the date of the Certification of Representative may be significant in future proceedings, we will deem the Certification of Representative to have been issued as of the date of this decision.

the decision and order reported at 354 NLRB No. 72, which has been set aside and which is incorporated herein by reference.<sup>5</sup>

Dated, Washington, D.C. August 23, 2010

---

Wilma B. Liebman, Chairman

---

Peter C. Schaumber, Member

---

Mark Gaston Pearce, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

<sup>5</sup> The Respondent has refused to bargain for the purpose of testing the validity of the certification of representative in the U.S. Courts of Appeals. The complaint so alleges and the Respondent admitted that allegation. We presume that Respondent's legal position remains unchanged, and therefore conclude that the Respondent will continue to refuse to bargain for that purpose notwithstanding the Board's decision on the representation issues in this matter. We therefore find that further proceedings would serve no purpose other than to delay the enforcement of employees' rights under the Act. We further find that no party will be prejudiced by the disposition of the Motion for Summary Judgment at this time. If the Respondent has or intends to commence bargaining at this time, it may file a motion for reconsideration so stating and the Board will issue an appropriate order.