NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Award **Number** 20721 Docket Number SG-20467

THIRD DIVISION

Dana E. Eischen, Referee

(Brotherhood of **Railroad** Signalmen <u>PARTIES TO DISPUTE</u>: ( (The Long Island Rail **Road** Company

**STATEMENT** OF CLAIM: Claim of the General **Committee** of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Long Island pail Road that:

(a) Carrier is in violation of the **Signalman's** Scope in allowing Electric Light employes to disconnect and relocate equipment specifically used for communication purposes. This particular **signaling** device is essential for the Train Dispatcher to contact the block operator at Brook Tower and was installed and is maintained by the Communication Dept. Its proper operation is the exclusive responsibility of said department.

(b) Carrier now pay to Maintainer J. A. Ryan three (3) hours pay at the straight-time as a consequence of the violation.

OPINION OF BOARD: The Organization contends that the Carrier violated the Scope **Rule** of the applicable Signalmen's Agreement when, on or about April 13, 1972, electrician employes in Carrier's Electric Light and Power Department moved a buzzer some 8 or 9 inches to make room for a conduit they were installing. It is unrefuted that no wires were removed or changed, rather two mounting screws were removed to enable movement of the buzzer and then reinserted to remount the equipment in its new location. The instant **claim** alleging a Scope **Rule** violation by Carrier and demanding a remedy of three hours at the straight time rate was filed on June 10, 1972. The claim was handled in the usual manner on the property without settlement and comes now to our Board for resolution.

In denying the claim, Carrier urges that the work in question was perfoned by the Electric Light employees without the direction or concurrence of management. Additionally, Carrier argues that the work performed was no violation of the Scope Rule, was in any **event <u>de minimis</u>** and that no loss was suffered.

The Organization insists that the work in question was reserved unto the Signal **employes** by the Scope Rule and that a violation is demonstrated on the record herein, notwithstanding the quantum of work involved.

A careful review of the record shows no evidence to refute the assertion that the work in question was performed by the electrical employees without instructions or communications with anyone in authority from the Carrier: <u>i.e.</u> voluntarily and without directions and authority. Having established this uncontroverted evidence on the record we need go no further to resolve this matter.

•

Award Number 20721 Page 2 Docket Number SG-20467

We have been presented before with cases wherein the record does not show that disputed work was performed with the knowledge and consent of Carrier.

In Award 16837 we stated:

"This Board has held on numerous occasions that absent directions and authority voluntary service cannot be asserted to support a claim."

See also Award Nos. 18369, 18996, 19472.

We find the reasoning in these Awards applicable herein and persuasive. Accordingly we shall dismiss the instant claim.

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 Agreement was not violated.

## ANARD

Claim dismissed.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Third Division

ATTEST:

Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 16th day of May 1975.

## Dissent to Award No. 20721. Decket No. 53-20467

The effect of the Majority's holding in Award No. 2072) is to permit the respondent Carrier to rely upon its own negligence in not properly or completely proparing for the work to be done by its electricians and by failing to properly instruct those employee or to control their work.

I dissent.

M. A. Gellers  $E_{\rm c}$ 

W. W. Alfae, Cr. Lebor Macher