NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 22085 Docket Number CL-21845

Herbert L. Marx, Jr., Referee

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

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

(Union Pacific Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood, (GL-8288) that:

- 1. The Carrier violated the Rules Agreement effective May 1, 1955, as amended July 15, 1967, particularly the disciplinary rules when it imposed discipline of dismissal from the service upon Mr. John Arnold. Collett, Junior Console Operator, Omaha, Nebraska, Union Pacific Headquarters Building, Management Information Service Roster No. 21, on April 22, 1975.
- 2. Carrier shall compensate Mr. John Arnold **Collett** one (1) day's vacation pay for April 1, 1975; further, that he be compensated for eight (8)hours' pay **each** work day **commencing** April 2, 1975 until restored to service on September 2, 1975 and for **all** overtime he would have worked during that period.
- 3. Carrier shall pay him ten (10) percent interest on any end all monies that he was deprived of during his improper dismissal from the service.
- 4. Carrier **shall** include **any wage** increases placed in effect and any change in fringe benefits during the period of dismissal which Claimant would otherwise have been entitled.
- 5. Claimant's record shall be cleared of any disciplinary action taken as a result of the arbitrary, unfair, illegal, partial, biased, discriminatory and grossly unjust healing held on April 8, 1975.

OPINIONOF BCARD: This dispute stems from Carrier's dismissal of Claimant following an investigation held on April 8, 1975. Claimant appeared at the investigation under charge of being absent without proper authority on April 1, 1975.

After carefully reviewing the record, we find that Claimant was afforded a **fair and impartial** healing **and that,** except as hereinafter noted, the case was free f-mm procedural defect. Accordingly, we turn to the merits.

In essence, Claimant was brought to trial and discharged from service - later changed to a five-month disciplinary suspension (the first actual discipline assessed Claimant during his railroad career). This disciplinary action was for absenting himself from his assignment and for failing to follow the proper procedure to request a vacation day, as set forth in Carrier's rules. Claimant contends that he had placed on the desk of his supervisor a written request to take one day's vacation on April 1, 1975, and thus he was excused from work.

We find sufficient evidence in the record to establish that **Claimant** had not discussed with, or received permission from, his superiors to take April 1 as a vacation day.

Further, we find that Claimant did not follow establish procedures to request vacation time **and** that merely placing a vacation request on a supervisor's desk does not rise to the level of receiving approval for a vacation. Under these circumstances some discipline was warranted.

We conclude, however, that a five-month actual suspension was grossly excessive when weighed against the offense. Moreover, Claimant had never before been assessed discipline. We have often held that the purpose of discipline is to teach and not to penalize. Ten days is an appropriate disciplinary suspension under the circumstances, and we accordingly reduce the discipline to a ten-day suspension.

Carrier argues that Rule 45(a) of the agreement permitted it to withhold Claimant from service pending the conclusion of the investigation. The rule reads:

"(a) No employe will be disciplined or dismissed without a fair hearing by his supervising officer. Suspension in proper cases pending a hearing, which will be held within seven (7) days of the time charge is made or employe suspended. will not be considered a violation of this principle. At a reasonable time prior to the hearing the employe will be apprised of the precise charge against him; in case of unsatisfactory service or incompetency all charges to be investigated will be stated. The employe will have reasonable opportunity to secure the presence of witnesses and the right to be represented by the duly accredited representatives as defined in Rule 57.

"Investigations and hearings shall be held when **possible** at home terminal of the employe involved and at such time as not to cause the **employe** to lose time." (Emphasis added)

Cur review of the record leads us to find that this was not a case properly justifying the withholding of an employe from service pending hearing.

Accordingly, we also find that Claimant shall not be compensated for April 1, the day he sought to take as a vacation day. Claimant did not have permission to be absent on this day.

Claimant shall be compensated for **all** wages lost between April 2, **1975** (the date he was improperly withheld **from** service) to and including April 22, **1975** (the date he was discharged from service) account being improperly withheld from service. Claimant shall **also** be compensated in accordance **with** the second **paragraph** of **Rule** 45(a) for wage loss incurred subsequent to May 2, **1975**, when his ten-day suspension was concluded. **The** interest claimed in part **3** of the Statement of Claim is denied.

<u>FINDINGS</u>: 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 violated.

A W A R D

Claim sustained to the extent and in the amount set forth in Opinion.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: <u>U. Paulas</u> Executive Secretary

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