

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number **21979**
Docket Number CL-21618

Irwin M. **Lieberman**, Referee

(Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and
(Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers,
(Express and Station **Employees**
PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (
(Portland **Terminal** Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: **Claim** of the System Committee of the Brotherhood
(GL-8177) that:

1. Carrier violated the provisions of the Schedule Agreement between the parties when it failed to compensate Ms. V. **McKechnie**, Relief Clerk, Portland Oregon, sick leave allowance for January 9 and 10, 1975.

2. Carrier shall **now** compensate Ms. V. **McKechnie** two days' sick leave allowance for January 9 and 10, 1975.

OPINION OF BOARD: At the outset, Carrier raises the argument that this dispute should properly be referred to Special Board of Adjustment 605 since it involves the application of **the February 7, 1965 Agreement**. An examination of the record of this dispute makes it evident to us that **this** claim does not turn upon the application of the **February 7, 1965 Agreement**, but rather relates directly to the provisions of the schedule agreement. Even though Claimant was a protected **employee** at the time the claim arose, and was receiving compensation at her protected rate under the February 7, 1965 Agreement, the dispute herein concerns the application of the sick leave allowance of Rule 48 of the parties' agreement and is properly before this Board. See Award 18385 and Awards 105 and 314 of Special Board of Adjustment 605.

With respect to the merits, Claimant had been displaced from her regular assignment December 19, 1974. Two days later she exercised her seniority and displaced a junior **employee** and began qualifying on Relief Position No. 521; she was paid her protected rate during this period. On January 9th and **10th**, 1975, two of the assigned **workdays** of Position 521, she reported off sick and claimed sick pay under **the** provision of Rule 48 of the applicable agreement. That rule provides:

"SICK-LEAVE **ALLOWANCE**

Rule 48:

(a) **Employees** who **on** January 1st of each year have been in service one year or more will be allowed Sick Leave with pay as follows:

1. One (1) year and less than two (2) years-- five (5) working days.
2. Two (2) years and less than three (3) years-- seven and one-half (7½) working days.
3. Three (3) years and over--ten (10) working days.

(b) **Employees** who are off account sickness in excess of the specified allowance in any year, will be **given** additional time off with pay to the extent of their unused sick leave allowance in the previous year.

(c) The employing officer must be satisfied that the illness is bona fide. Satisfactory evidence in the form of a certificate from a reputable physician, preferably a Company physician, will be required in case of doubt. The Local and General **Chairman** will cooperate with the Official when doubt exists.

(d) In the application of this rule, it is understood **that** where there is no necessity for a position to be kept up daily, it may be **blanked**, or the duties assigned to the remaining **employees** in the department. No overtime, Sunday, or holiday work will be required of the remaining **employees** by reason of the granting of the sick leave.

(e) The above limits of sick leave may be extended in individual meritorious cases, but such extensions will only be made by agreement between the representatives of the Carrier and of the **employee.**"

Carrier denied Claimant's sick claim based on the following:

"The two days sick leave claimed during your student period was at a time when you were being paid as a student to learn new work in connection with the February, 1965, Clerks Agreement. This agreement has

"no provision for compensation at times other than **when** you are able to work, and claims for sick leave are therefore excluded **under** the concept of the Agreement. "

Under all the circumstances herein, we find that Carrier's denial of sick leave payment, on the basis stated above, was improper. Sick leave is paid or not paid under the terms and provisions of the sick leave rule of the Agreement. The compensation and other provisions of the February 7, 1965 Agreement are not controlling. **Rule 48** does not bar sick leave payments **when** an **employee** is receiving compensation as a protected **employee** nor does it bar payments **when** an **employee** is breaking in on a job under the provisions of Rule 8. For those reasons the Claim must be sustained. 3

Some **eleven** months after the claim had been initiated, Carrier raised an additional defense **with** respect to paragraph (c) of Rule 48 concerning a certificate from a reputable physician attesting to the bona fide illness of Claimant. Proof of illness and satisfactory evidence are proper considerations **when** doubt exists **over** eligibility for sick pay. However, questions arising under the application of **Rule 48 (c)** must be timely raised. Demanding the evidence specified in the rule for the first time eleven months after the claim for sick benefits has been filed seems quite tardy, particularly since Carrier's original position **was** not that it doubted that Claimant was sick but that it questioned her entitlement to the benefit under the provisions of the February 7, 1965 Agreement. 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 **Employees** involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and **Employees** 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 violated.

Award Number 21979
Docket Number CL-21618

Page 4

A W A R D

Claim sustained.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By **Order** of Third Division

ATTEST: A. W. Pauls
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this **31st** day of **March** 1978.

