

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 21895
Docket Number SG-21898

George S. Roukis, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: {
(Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen
(The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: **Claim** of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad **Signalmen** on the **Baltimore and Ohio** Railroad company:

The Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, as **amended**, particularly the Scope and Rule 47 (a) paragraph 6, by not extending Bulletin **No. 526** dated December 20, **1974** to the Baltimore West **End** Seniority District.

Claim (a):

That the Carrier now be required to accept a late bid from Mr. T. R. Gillespie, ID **No. 1510052**, **Monongah** Division, home seniority district, but was furloughed from this seniority district and was working on the Baltimore West **End** and should receive a seniority date on the **Cumberland** Division Seniority Roster as of January **3, 1975**.

(b):

Mr. T. R. Gillespie should now be allowed \$3.00 per day under the **298** Award from the time a new man was hired, who was **Mr. L. Weaver**. This **claim** of \$3.00 per day continue as long as this violation exists, as Mr. Gillespie did occur expenses while working away from home.
(Carrier file: **2-SG-439**)

OPINION OF BOARD: There are two separate **and** distinct issues involved in this docket, namely:

(a) The correct roster standing of claimant vis a vis Signal **Helper** L. Weaver, and

(b) A claim for "meal allowance expenses" under **the** provisions of Award of Arbitration Board **No. 298**.

We will deal with these issues separately.

The operative facts relative to the seniority issue are reasonably clear. **Claimant** Gillespie, while on furlough from the **Monongah** Division (his "home" district) made application for **and** was awarded a position covered by the Signalman's Rules Agreement on the Baltimore Division, West **End**. While working on the Baltimore Division, West End, a Signal Helper position was bulletined on the Cumberland Division for which no bids were received. Therefore, Mr. L. Weaver was hired as a new employe and assigned to the position effective January 6, 1975. The crux of the contention here is that the Cumberland Division bulletin was not made available to the **employees** of the Baltimore Division, West **End** as required by **Rule 47(a) 6** which **provides** in pertinent part as **follows**:

"(a) After **the** closing time for receiving bids the position will be awarded by one **of** the following procedures in the order indicated:

"* * * * *

"6. By **extending** the bulletin to other seniority districts in the **same** Region, but nothing herein will be construed as requiring the assignment of a non-applicant to a position on other **than** his home seniority district. * * *."

Petitioner contends that if the provisions of Rule 47(a) 6 **had** been complied with, claimant would have made application for the bulletined position **and** thereby would have established seniority standing on the **Cumberland** Division **ahead of Mr. Weaver**. Petitioner argues that this contention is believable because of the fact that **claimant** did - in **fact** - make application for and was awarded a similar position on the **Cumberland** Division **within** two (2) months after Mr. Weaver was employed. Petitioner presented, on the **property**, an affidavit from **claimant** in which he **alleged** that neither he nor his foreman nor his supervisor on the Baltimore Division had received the bulletin which resulted in Mr. Weaver being employed.

Carrier, on the other hand, offers this Board no evidence to show that the Cumberland Division bulletin in question (Bulletin No. 526) **was** - in fact - posted on the Baltimore West **End** Division. Carrier candidly admits that **the** Award to Bulletin No. 526 was "for some inexplicable reason -- not sent to the Baltimore West **End** Division". Carrier further admits **that** a subsequent Cumberland Division bulletin (No. 502) also "had not been distributed to the **Baltimore** or **Monongah** Division ---".

It was ~~through~~ this latter error, that was later rectified by the posting of Bulletin No. 504, that Claimant Gillespie subsequently acquired a position and established seniority standing on the Cumberland Division effective February 21, 1975.

The Board has made an extensive examination of this record and has considered the assertions advanced by both parties. It is our conclusion that Carrier's reliance on the contention that, because the Baltimore West ~~End~~ Division Superintendent's name appeared on the advertising bulletin, it, therefore, must have been posted on that division, is not reasonable. All that shows with certainty is that the bulletin was properly prepared. It is not unreasonable to conclude that - like the Award to Bulletin No. 526 or like Bulletin No. 502 - this bulletin too was "for some inexplicable reason --- not sent to the Baltimore West ~~End~~ Division". Clearly some positive refutation to claimant's affidavit was indicated. None was presented. Therefore, it is this Board's decision that, based on the circumstances present in this case, Claimant Gillespie should be listed on the Cumberland Division seniority roster with a date of January 3, 1975, immediately ahead of Mr. L. Weaver.

As for part (b) of this case which asks for payment of "\$3.00 per day under the 298 Award", the Board is unable to find any justification for or Rule support of such a payment. The Cumberland Division position in question was not in any way involved with any application or provision of either Appendix "E" or Rule 41 of the Agreement - each of which relate to Award of Arbitration Board No. 298.

Therefore, part (b) of the subject must be and is denied.

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

Award Number 21895
Docket Number SG-21898

Page 4

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

That the Agreement was violated in regards to Rule 47(a) 6.

A W A R D

Claim sustained in part, as indicated in the Opinion.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST:

A. W. Pauls
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 15th day of February 1978.

