

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD THIRD DIVISION

David Dolnick, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

AMERICAN TRAIN DISPATCHERS ASSOCIATION ST. LOUIS-SAN FRANCISCO RAILWAY COMPANY

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the American Train Dispatchers Association that:

- (a) The St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company (hereinafter "the Carrier") violated the effective Agreement between the parties, Article 1 thereof in particular, when on June 22, 1969, it required and/or permitted other than those covered thereby, to perform work covered by said Agreement.
- (b) Carrier shall now compensate Train Dispatcher J. R. Lyden one day's compensation at time and one-half the daily rate appliable to Assistant Chief Dispatcher for said violation on the rest day of Claimant.

EMPLOYES' STATEMENT OF FACTS: There is an Agreement in effect between the parties, copy of which is on file with this Board, and the same is incorporated into this Ex Parte Submission as though fully set out herein.

Article 1 — Scope is identical in the Agreement effective September 1, 1949, revised as of January 1, 1953 and again revised effective October 1, 1965, insofar as the rules material to this dispute are concerned.

For the Board's ready reference, Article 1, Scope, of the Agreement is here quoted in full text:

"ARTICLE 1

(a) SCOPE

This agreement shall govern the hours of service and working conditions of train dispatchers. The term 'train dispatcher' as hereinafter used, shall include night chief, assistant chief, trick, relief and extra train dispatchers. It is agreed that one chief dispatcher in each dispatching office shall be excepted from the scope and provisions of this agreement.

Note (1): Positions of excepted chief dispatcher will be filled by employes holding seniority under this agreement.

what he has handy to Quanah. If possible bring 10 mty covered hoppers and 2 mty box.

No. 31 did as instructed.

The various reasons given for the declination of this claim are set forth in the Carrier's letter November 19, 1969, copy attached as Carrier's Exhibit No. 38. The trainmaster who is alleged to have committed the violations in Claims 37 and 38 is one of the division officers who, as such, has responsible control over the operation of a division, or a terminal, or of a major activity within an operating division, and when acting in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities, it is not mandatory that a division trainmaster exercise such responsible control only through employes of the train dispatchers' class, nor do the Rules of the Train Dispatchers' Agreement place such a hindrance or limitation upon him.

(Exhibits not reproduced.)

OPINION OF BOARD: The claim as presented to the Carrier reads:

"Work Extra 510 on June 27, 1969, was instructed to unload 5 panel rail at F488. Instructions that were issued by an employe not within the Scope of the said Agreement. Work Extra 510 complied with the above instructions."

Employes have not identified the employe who sent the alleged message or his position. Carrier, not only does the Carrier have no record of this alleged message, but has shown that "no Work Extra 510 operated on the claim date." Employes have failed to prove the merits of the claim by a prependerance of evidence.

FINDINGS: The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

That the parties waived oral hearing;

That the Carrier and the Employes involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employes within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

That this Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein; and

That the allegations in Employes submissions are not sufficient to support a consideration and a determination of the merits of the claim.

AWARD

Claim dismissed.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of THIRD DIVISION

ATTEST: E. A. Killeen Executive Secretary

16

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 24th day of March 1972.

Keenan Printing Co., Chicago, Ill.

Printed in U.S.A.