NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 24178
Docket Number CL-24249

Ida Klaus, Referee

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

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

(The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood (GL-9482) that:

- (a) That the Carrier violated and continues to violate the General Agreement when beginning on or about August 30, 1978, It did without notice, conference, or agreement, arbitrarily and unilaterally removed work from the C&O Pittsburgh District, Telephone Switchboard Operator Roster at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and transferred suchworkto the C&O Baltimore District Switchboard operator Roster at Baltimore, Maryland and to certain B&O positions (contract allanon-contract) at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and
- (b) That each **and** every **employe** whose position was abolished or who was affected, **as** a result of these **abolishments** and who suffered loss as **aresult of this arbitrary action** of the Carrier **shall be** compensated for **any and all loss or adverse effect retroactive to the date** on **which tie** violation occurred. Claim to continue until correction is **made**.

OPINION OF BOARD: The claim asserts a violation of the consolidation and reorganization rule of the Agreement by reason of au alleged unilateral transfer of work from the C&O Pittsburgh District Telephone Switchboard Operator Roster.

The Carrier denies the allegations. It replies that it did abolish the Pittsburgh switchboard positions and did change vork shifts, but did not transfer any part of the work of the abolished positions. It twk that action for reasons of economy, it says, ad not pursuant to any consolidation or reorganization, and it gave proper contractual notice to the employes affected by its action.

From our review of the record and after considering the arguments made on the property and before this Board, we are unable to conclude that there was in fact a transfer of work. Thus, we cannot find in this record the proof necessary to support the factual allegation on which the claim is based. In our view, the Organization's factual case has been built on no more than unfounded assumption and surmise. The burden of substantiating the allegations of the claim rests with the petitioner. Accordingly we must deny the claim.

FINDINGS: The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finis 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 not violated.

A W A R D

Claim aeniea.

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

ATTEST: Acting Executive Secretary

National Railroad Adjustment Board

Rosemarie Bras& - Administrative

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 28th day of February 1983.



į