## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

## THIRD DMSION

Award Number 24047 Docket Number MS-24301

## George S. Roukis, Referee

(Sheree C. Campbell

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

(Burlington Northern Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "I was not used for job #012 (crew calling) even when I was available to protect this position on July 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 29, 30 and August 5, 6, 11, 12 of 1979. Instead junior employees Mr. Frank Kenealy and Mr. Dan Kenealy were used in my place. Granted., I had an investigation and was disqualified from PCI duties, but there was no mention at all of my being disgualified from any crew calling position. Thus. I feel that pay for 12 days are rightly due to-me.

Please also find **under** caption of "Statement of Facts" that I am fighting this claim for **the moral** aspects involving this **whole** incident.

OPINION OF BOARD: The pivotal question before this Board is whether Claimant's petition to the Third Division was properly filed in accordance with the **provisions** of the **controlling** agreement and the applicable Rules of **this** Board. From the record submitted to this Division, it is apparent that Claimant was clearly obligated to file the instant claim with us by July 25, 1981 rather than August 23, 1981 and her late filing constituted an improper submission. The rules of this Board are uniformly applicable to the national railroad industry end implicitly **indexed** to **the** time limit **provisions** of **the** collective bargaining agreements regulating the labor relations function in the industry. Thus, unless a specific variance has been agreed upon by the parties at the situs of the appeals process to extend the time limit requirements, we cannot modify the parties agreement. By doing such we would be in effect re-writing the parties labor agreement. Moreover, in view of the extensive discussion and Carrier's explicit extension of the nine months time limit requirements of Rule 59 Paragraph C cm April 28,1981, we are compelled by the force and consistency of our decisional law to sustain Carrier's determination. The present claim is procedurally defective.

See Third Division Award Nos. 17694, 15983, 12718, 8776, 8515, 8479, 8476, 8476, 8474, et. al.

**<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**; Award Number 24047 Docket Number MS-24301

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

That the Claim is barred.

AWARD

## Claim dismissed.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

By Order of Third Division

Attest: Acting Executive Secretary National Railroad Adjustment Board

By Rosemarie Brasch - Administrative Assistant

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 29th day of November 1982.

