NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 23230 Docket Number CL-22933

James F. Scearce, Referee

(Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and **Steamship** Clerks, - ' (Freight **Handlers, Express and** Station **Employes** <u>PARTIES TO DISPUTE</u>: ((Southern Railway company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood (GL-8771)

Carrier violated the Agreementwhen it **injustly suspended** J. L. W1111ams, Clerk-Operator, Charleston, South Caroline, from the **service** of the Company, commencing August 3, 1974, and ending September 16, 1974, a period of 32 work days.

For this violation, the Carrier shall now compensate Claimant William,, Clerk-Operator, Charleston, South Carolina, by paying him for all time lost as a result of this **injust** discipline.

OPINION OF BOARD: Claimant was regularly assigned as Operator-Clerk on second shift at the Carrier's Seven Wile Yard at Charleston, South Carolina. His work week was Thursday-Monday with Tuesdays and Wednesdays as rest days. On August 1, 1974 -- a Thursday -- the Claimant contacted the appropriate Carrier official some six hours prior to his shift start requesting to be off for "personal business." Absence of an available extra board employe caused his request to be denied initially; however, the Claiment called attention to the fact that another Operator-Clerk (Martin) was observing his rest day and could be called in. The official agreed to try to contact Martin but contends he requested the Claimant to call back within two hours -- to determine if Martin was available. Per such **supervisor**, the Claimant did uot call back, but as it turned out **Martin** was available even though he had **pressing personal** business of his own and would have opted to continue his rest day; however, Martin was adamant that he could onlywork the one day and would have to retain his otkr rest day to attend to such personal business. On August 2, 1974 the **Claimant neither** reported for duty nor informed the Carrier of his status and his position went unprotected for about an hour before the Carrier could cover it; when it did **ithad to** prevail upon **Martin** to again give up his rest day. The **Claimant was** terminated for his failure to protect his position on August 2, 1974; the Claimant's prior disciplinary record -- two suspensions for failing to protect his position -- were considered in **determining** removal as the appropriate action. Subsequent consideration by the Carrier resulted in a reduction of **removal** to a **45-day** suspension; it is this disciplinary action that is before this Board.

Award Number **23230** Docket **Number** CL-22933

Page 2

Essentially, the issue goes to what was agreed upon during the conversation between the Claimant and the Operator some hours before his shift was to start on August 1, 1974. The Claimant contends he did not specify precisely when he would return and thus was not obliged to return on August 2, or to report his status. This Board's review of the transcript and the record as a whole leads to a conclusion that the Carrier was justified in exacting the removal of the Claimant; its subsequent agreement to reduce it to a 45-day suspension was not excessive and, considering the fact that the Claimant had less than a year's seniority and two (2) progressive disciplinary suspensions -- one for 60 days during this period, the Carrier's reduction of removal to a suspension was a show of generosity -- which this Board trusts the Claimant used to demonstrate his worthiness as an exemplary employe.

<u>FINDINCS</u>: The Third Division of the **Adjustment** Board, after giving the parties to this dispute due notice of hearing thereon, **and** upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds **and** holds:

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 RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: **Executive**Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 16th day of March 1981.