

NATIONAL RAILROAD **ADJUSTMENT** BOARD

**THIRD** DIVISION

Award Number 22389

**Docket Number MW-22435**

George **S.** Roukis, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: ( (Brotherhood of Maintenance of **Way Employees**  
(Missouri Pacific Railroad **Company**  
( (Former Chicago & Eastern Illinois R.R.)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the System **Committee** of the Brotherhood that:

(1) The dismissal of Machine Operator R. L. Arnold because of justifiable absenteeism from October 11 through October 25, 1976 was unwarranted, without just and sufficient cause and was arbitrarily and capriciously imposed (System File **K** 214-83).

(2) The claimant shall be restored to service, **with** pay for **time** lost and with all other benefits prescribed in **Agreement** Rule **34(d).**"

OPINION OF BOARD: Claimant was charged with being absent without proper authority from October 11, 1976 through October 25, 1976.

An investigative hearing was held on Nwember 5, 1976 at which time **he was** found guilty of the charge and dismissed from service, effective Nwember 15, 1976.

While this decision was being processed through the appropriate grievance **steps**, Claimant unilaterally negotiated a separate understanding with Carrier, which prwided that he submit a letter requesting reinstatement with seniority rights unimpaired, but without compensation for **time** lost. Accordingly, Claimant wrote this letter on April 18, 1977 which was received by Carrier on April 20, 1977. It read:

"I am writing this letter to request reinstatement to **my** job.

I would very **much** appreciate a chance, and I **would** do my best to **uphold** my end of the bargain.

I would like to return, with my seniority and rights not to be impaired."

It did not contain, however, any reference to waiver of **payment** for **time** lost.

Carrier **immediately** reminded him of this **omission** and **he** submitted a second letter inadvertently dated April 22, 1976, rather **than** 1977, which was **received** by Carrier on April 25, 1977. It **was** directly related to his April 18, 1977 letter and stated:

"As per request, I am writing this letter in addition to other **correspondence**.

I would willingly relinquish any and all claim to pay for time lost since **my** release on 11-16-76; in **hopes** to expedite my return to work."

On September 6, 1977, approximately five (5) months later, **Claimant** was **restored** to his position, with **his** seniority rights intact, but without back pay.

The Organization later filed notice **on** December 30, 1977 that it intended to proceed with this case to the National Railroad **Adjustment** Board .

In this dispute, we are faced with a particular course of conduct that renders academic, the Organization's **contention** that Claimant's **individual** settlement was **inconsistent** with its **agreement vested administrative** rights.

While **we have** carefully **reviewed** our decisional law on this point **and** recognize the import of Third Division Award 20832, **we find** in this case a particular set **of circumstances**, which **indicate** that the Organization was aware **that** Carrier was going to investigate the possibility of reinstating **Claimant** on a leniency basis without back pay.

In Carrier's letter to the **General** Chairman, dated March 31, 1977, approximately three weeks before Claimant requested leniency restoration, it noted:

". . . you were advised **during conference that** we would further investigate to determine if consideration is being given to Mr. Arnold's reinstatement on a **leniency** basis without pay for time lost. We will advise you in connection with this **matter** as soon as **we** have completed our investigation."

**Inasmuch** as Carrier was under an obligation by this letter to report its result to the Organization, the Claimant's efforts and the long silence between April 22, 1977 and September 6, 1977 indicate de facto waiver and acquiescence.

While recognizing that our holding in Award 20832 would appear to sanction Claimant's unilateral settlement initiatives, **we feel** that the Organization should have continued its processing of the grievance shortly after Carrier's March 31, 1977 letter (**supra**) or protest sooner the impropriety of Claimant's action. It **must** have been aware of these developments.

Moreover, while we are somewhat perplexed by Carrier's long delay in restoring Claimant to his position, we **must** conclude by logical inference that all the parties accepted this state of affairs. Neither the **Claimant** nor the Organization posited any question or challenge during this time.

It is indeed unfortunate that Claimant wasn't returned to his position early, **but** he agreed to the conditions of **reinstatement** and the Organization did not contest this arrangement **between** April, 1977 and September, 1977.

Consequently, under these unique circumstances and fact patterns we must deny this claim.

**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 not violated.

Award Number 22369  
Docket Number MW-22435

Page 4

A W A R D

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: *AW Paulos*  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 27th day of April 1979.

