NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD SECOND DIVISION Award No. 9488 Docket No. 9289 2-SOU-CM-'83

The Second Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Rodney E. Dennis when award was rendered.

Parties to Dispute:	(	Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada	
	2	Southern Railway Company	

## Dispute: Claim of Employes:

- 1. That Carman T. C. Davis was unjustly required to forfeit expense money paid him by Muscogee County, Georgia in order to receive pay for days lost from work while serving as a juror.
- 2. That accordingly the Carrier be ordered to reimburse Mr. Davis thirty dollars (\$30.00), the amount of expense money he was required by the Carrier to pay to the Carrier.

## Findings:

The Second Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

The carrier or carriers and the employe or employes involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employe within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act as approved June 21, 1934.

This Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein.

Parties to said dispute were given due notice of hearing thereon.

Claimant, T. C. Davis, was called for jury duty in Muscogee County, Georgia. As a result of his service in this capacity, he missed three days of work, for which he claimed compensation under Rule 37 of the agreement. That rule reads as follows:

> "RULE 37. When a regularly assigned employee is summoned for jury duty and is required to lose time from his assignment as a result thereof, he shall be paid for actual time lost with a maximum of a basic day's pay at the straight time rate of his position for each day lost less the amount allowed him for jury service for each such day, excepting allowances paid by the Court for meals, lodging or transportation, subject to the following qualification requirements and limitations:

(a) An employee must exercise any right to secure exemption from the summons and/or jury service under federal, state or municipal statute and will be excused from duty when necessary without loss of pay to apply for the exemption. Form 1 Page 2

(b) An employee must furnish the carrier with a statement from the court of jury allowances paid and the days on which jury duty was performed."

Claimant was paid \$10.00 each day for serving as a juror, for a total of \$50.00. Carrier required Claimant to turn over the \$10.00 per day that he received for jury duty on the days for which he claimed compensation. The Organization contends that this is a violation of Rule 37, since the \$10.00 per day allowance was for food, travel, and lodging and that is exempt under Rule 37. Carrier alleges to the contrary and argues that the \$10.00 per day that Claimant received from the County was a fee for juror service and not an expense payment for food, travel, and lodging.

Quite simply, the issue before this Board is what does the \$10.00 per day payment represent -- a fee or money for expenses?

A careful review of this record reveals that the County of Muscogee supplied both Carrier and the Claimant with information on the payment that one might consider to be conflicting. The County sent Carrier a form indicating that Claimant was paid a rate of \$10.00 per day for five days served as a juror. The check received by Claimant for \$50.00 had the words <u>expense allowance</u> typed on it. Quite logically both parties point to these documents as support for their respective positions. It is interesting to note, however, that nowhere else in this record, other than Claimant's contention that the \$10.00 paid him was for food and travel, is food, travel, or lodging mentioned. While Claimant certainly could spend his \$10.00 per day for food or travel, there is nothing in the record to indicate that the payment he received was specifically paid to cover meal expenses, travel expenses, or lodging.

It appears from the record that the \$10.00 payment is more in the nature of an allowance for jury duty service rather than a payment for food, travel, or lodging. As such, the \$10.00 fee is returnable to Carrier, as specified in Rule 37. The Organization has not carried its required burden of proof in this case and the claim must be denied.

## AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Second Division

Attest: Acting Executive Secretary National Railroad Adjustment Board eena By Osemarie Brasch - Administrative Assistant Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 18th day of May, 1983.