## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 21109
Docket Number CL-21235

James C. McBrearty, Referee

(Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

(The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood, GL-7906, that:

- (a) Carrier violated the **rules** of the current Clerks' Agreement at Los Angeles, California, on October 9, 1973, **when** it wrongfully discharged Ms. Jon L. **Bice** from **service**, **and**
- (b) Mr. Jon L. Bice shall now be reinstated and compensated for all monetary loss suffered commencing October 9, 1973, and continuing until such time as he is reinstated, as a result of such violation of Agreement rules
- (c) The Carrier shall be required to pay 6% interest compounded daily on all wages wrongfully withheld from Mr. Jon L. Bice commencing October 9, 1973.

OPINIONOFBOARD: Claimant began service with the Carrier on July 21, 1971, as a Record File Clerk.

On September 24, 1973, **Claimant** was **advised by** Carrier that a formal **investigation** was being called for October 1, 1973, to determine the facts and place his **responsibility**, if any, in connection with **falsification** of records to absent himself from his assignment, April 13, April 24, and May 17, 1973, in the possible violation of Rules 16, 17 and 18 of the General **Rules** for the Guidance of **Employes.** 

As a result of the investigation that was held on October 1, 1973, Claimant was removed from service on October 9, 1973. Claimant was found by Carrier tohave violated Rules 16, 17, and 18 of the General Rules for the Guidance of Employes, which read as follows:

16. **Employes** met obey instructions from the proper authority in matters pertaining to their respective branches of the **service.** 

They must not withhold information, or fail to give all the facts, regarding irregularities, accidents, personal injuries or **rule violations**.

Employes must report for duty is required and those subject to call for duty will be at their usual calling place, or leave information as to where they may be located. They must not absent themselves from duty, exchange duties or substitute other persons in their places without proper authority.

- 17. **Employes** must not be careless of the safety of themselves or others, indifferent to duty, insubordinate, dishonest, **immoral**, quarrelsome, or vicious. They **must** conduct themselves in a **manner** that will **not**bring discredit on their fellow **employes** or subject the railroad to criticism and loss of good will.
- 18. Courteous deportment is required of all employer in their dealings with the public, their **subordinates**, and each other.

**Employes must** not enter into altercations, play practical jokes, scuffle, or wrestle on company property.

**Employes** must devote themselves exclusively to their duties during their tour of duty.

Numerous prior awards of this Board set forth our function in discipline cases. Our function in discipline cases is <u>not</u> to substitute our judgment for the Carrier's <u>nor</u> to decide the <u>matter in accord</u> with <u>what</u> we might or might not have <u>done</u> had it been ours to determine, but to pass <u>upon</u> the question whether, without weighing it, there is <u>substantial evidence</u> to <u>sustain</u> a finding of guilty. If that question is decided in the affirmative, the penalty imposed for the violation is a matter which rests in the <u>sound</u> <u>discretion</u> of the Carrier. We <u>are not</u> warranted in disturbing Carrier's penalty <u>unless</u> we can say it clearly appears <u>from</u> the record that the Carrier's action with <u>respect</u> thereto was discriminatory, unjust, unreasonable, <u>capricious</u> or arbitrary, so as to constitute an abuse of that discretion.

Turning then to the case at band, the **Board** notes that dishonesty in any **form** is a matter of serious **concern**, and often results in dismissal **from** the service of a Carrier.

The term "dishonesty" means misconduct that involves either money or property. It goes beyond misappropriation or theft in that it includes any conduct that tends to perpetuate a fraud on a carrier resulting in financial loss. A list of abuses in the category of dishonest acts would include taking or giving bribes, misusing carrier's records, forms, or procedures, tampering with vending machines, padding expenses reports, and using Carrier's funds for personal purpose\*. Falsifying work records or information on job applications are two particularly troublesome and common acts of dishonesty.

Such dishonest acts as these, among others, have been established as providing just cause for discipline or discharge. The burden of proof rests with the Carrier, as always, and the punishment must be timely and befit the employe's work record. Because a charge of dishonesty reflects upon a person's character and standing in society at large, the evidence presented by the charging party, the Carrier, must be fully persuasive, i.e., truly substantial and not flimsy.

This Board appears to agree generally that some discipline up to and including discharge is warranted when an **employe** is **proved** to have falsified time or production records, employment applications, or other Carrier **documents.and** forms, as well as obtaining permission to be off through misrepresentation. **However**, it **must** be shown that the act was a **deliverate** one with intent to defraud, rather than a **mere** oversight or lapse **of memory**.

Looking at the record as a whole, the Board finds there is substantial evidence to show that Claimant obtained permission to be off through misrepresentation, thereby not properly protecting his job assignment, and subjecting himself to discipline. Any unauthorized absence from duty during assigned hours is e very serious offense and frequently results in dismissal from the service.

The **charge** of Claimant that Carrier's discipline **was** harsh end **excessive** is not borne cut by the facts presented in the record. Carrier invested considerable **time** and expense to give Claimant three (3) complete **medical** examinations to see if there were any medical **problems which** would explain Claimant's excessive absenteeism of 774 days in one **13-month** period. In all of these examinations nothing medically wrong was **found** to explain Claimant's excessive absenteeism.

Moreover, after Carrier reviewed Claimant's past attendance record with **him** on August 24, 1973, Claimant was absent all or part **of** nine (9) days between August 27 and September 4, 1973.

The evidence is sufficiently substantial to support the charges that Claimant falsified records by stating that he was off sick, when, in fact, he was not on at least three occasions. We cannot say that the Carrier was in sny way arbitrary, capricious, or lacking in good faith. Carrier considered the past record of Claimant and properly considered it only in measuring end determining the penalty to be made. It was not used in an attempt to strengthen Carrier's case on the charges which are the subject of this opinion. In deference to Claimant's prior record, and the evidence presented at the hearing, Carrier was justified in dismissing the Claimant. We will accordingly deny the claim.

Award Number 21109 Docket Number CL-21235 Page 4

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.

AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILBOAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

By Order of **Third** Division

ATTEST: U.W. Paulse

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 29th day of June 1976.