NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 20970 Docket Number SC-20831

Irwin M. Lieberman, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen (Chicago and North Western Transportation Company

STATEMENTOFCLAIM: Claim of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Chicago and North Western Transportation Company:

(a) On or about November 21, 1972 the Carrier violated the current Signalman's Agreement, particularly the 5th paragraph of Rule 17 when it would not place Mr. A. E. Nenn, Sig. Mtnr. at Pt. Washington, Wis. on the permanent position of Ldr. Sig. Mtnr. at Appleton, Wis. and allow him to work the temporary position of Sig. Mtnr. at Oshkosh, Wis., pending return of J. A. Meyer.

(b) The **Carrier** now be required to place Mr. Nenn per his request, as stated in his letter of Sept. 14th and 27th, to the Sig. Supr., to the position as stated in (a) above.

(c) The Carrier be required to compensate and/or reimburse Mr. Nenn for all compensation he may have lost by this violation. <u>Car-</u> rier's File: 79-13-16

<u>OPINION OF BOARD</u>: This dispute relates to whether or not an employe may exercise several options, seriatim, **upon** being displaced, under two different **Rules**. The Rules are:

"RULE 17 - Except in the Central Seniority District, **incum**bents **of** existing positions and those subsequently established in excess of one year, may elect to retain their positions or within fourteen consecutive calendar days exercise displacement rights if changes occur under the following conditions of their positions:

- (a) Assigned days off duty.
- (b) Headquarters.
- (c) Territorial limits.
- (d) Starting **time**, except due to Daylight. Saving Time.

If positions are vacated **as** provided for in this **rule** it **will** be bulletined as a new position.

**Note:** At, points where the territorial limits **are** changed and there are two or **more** positions of the same seniority class involved, one or more of which is abolished, **the senior employe** 

Award Number 20970 Docket Number SG-20831

"will make the first selection. **The** remaining employe or employes of the **seme** seniority class may do likewise in seniority order."

"RULE 36(c) - Except as provided in rule 35 (b), when force is reduced, position abolished, or employes displaced, the affected employe must advise proper officer within three working days from date of bulletin his choice of displacement, aud, except in central seniority district he **will be** advised prior to position being abolished as to whom he may displace under rules applicable, so that such action may be taken on working day following date porition is abolished. In the central seniority district the affected employe may displace any junior employe of his class assigned to a permanent position. Outside the central seniority district the affected employe may displace any junior employe in his seniority class assigned to a permanent position with headquarters in camp cars, or assigned to crew not engaged in the maintenance of a section, plant or assigned to a shop, or position under direction of Supervisor Communications & Signals or on a second or third trick position on a section or plant. Illinois and Northwestern seniority district employes may displace any one of the three junior employes, Western and Northern seniority district employes may displace any one of the seven junior employes of the same class holding a permanent position assigned to a section, shop, plant or relief position.

An employe haying **displacement** rights may displace a junior employe on a **temporary** or 'pending **return'** position provided he **currently makes a** 'technical' **displacement** on **a permanent** position. An **employe** 'technically' displaced under provisions **hereof** will retain the right to remain on the **assignment** and **will** not be required to exercise displacing **rights** until actually **displaced.**"

Petitioner argues that Claimant, having **taken** action under the **shorter** option (Rule 36 (c)) may **not** be denied the right to subsequently exercise the 14 day option. It is urged that Carrier's position would result in giving **a senior man** only three days in which to make **a displace-ment**, whereas a junior **man** would have fourteen.

It is interesting to note that in its submission, Petitioner states: **"Upon** receipt of Bulletin **#17**, Mr. A. E. **Nenn**, the incumbent Award Number 20970 Docket number SC-20831

"of the Leading Signal **Maintainer** position at Port Washington, the first **position listed thereon** a6 being abolished, exercised his displacement rights under the **Note** at the **end** of Rule 17, **end within** the three-day period in Rule **36**, by placing himself on. . . ...the Signal Maintainer position at Port Washington....."

It **might** be construed that the Organization **is saying** that his one choice **was** exercised under both rules. However, in **subsequent** argument Petitioner **insists** that **Claimant** has the right to **make** three different choices, as indicated in the Statement of **Claim.** 

We cannot accept. the logic of Claimant. Although it is true that he had to make a choice under either Rule, both being applicable to the situation, he could not make three choices. After be opted for the Port Washington position, he was no longer in a displaced posture and able to exercise any further option. Additionally, It seems evident that he did exercise the option contained in the Note to Rule 17, supra, and certainly had no basis for then attempting to use the same Rule's fourteen day provision. Even if, a6 Petitioner contends, his choice was made pursuant to Rule 36 (c), there is no basis whatever for a second and third option to be exercised since he was no longer being displaced. He must be confined to one rule application. The Claim must be denied.

**<u>FINDINGS</u>**: The **Third** Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and **all** the evidence, find6 andholds:

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.

AWARD

Claim denied.

ATTEST: <u>AW. Paulas</u>

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Third Division

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 27th day of February 1976.