## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

## THIRD DIVISION

Award Nuder 24292 Docket Number CL-24399

Paul c. Carter, Referee

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

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

ų į

(Baltimore and Chio Railroad Company

**<u>STATEMENT OF CIAIM</u>**: Claim Of the System Committee of the Brotherhood (GL-9556) that:

(1) Carrier violated the Agreement between the Parties when, on January 19, 1981, it imposed discipline of thirty (30) days suspension from service upon Extra employee J. M. Walker sod it also imposed dismissal from service to Carrier upon Mr. Walker concurrent with the expiration of the thirty-day suspension period, effective February 18, 1981, as a result of two (2) investigations held at 8:00 AM and 9:00 AM on December 30, 1980, and

(2) As a result of such improprieties, Carrier shall now be required to reimburse Claiment J. M. Walker for lost wages, five (5) days per week, beginning January 19, 1981, and continuing, until he is restored to Carrier's service and that his service record be cleared of the notings incidents to the suspension and dismissal.

OPINION OF BOARD:Claimant was employed as an extra clerk. Beginning Monday,<br/>December 15, 1980, be was assigned to fill a 6:00 A.M.to2:00 P.M. vacation vacancy et Carrier'sPort Covington Terminal, Baltimore,<br/>Maryland.

The Carrier contends that on Tuesday, December 16, 1980, Claimant failed to report for duty until 7:15 A.M., or 1 hour and 15 minutes late, and that on Wednesday, December 17, 1980, he failed to report for work etall. On December 22, 1980, Claimant was formally charged with responsibility in connection with "your I leged failure to report for duty at the designated timeandplace, 6:00 A.M. on December 16, 1980, at Port Covington". Investigation of the charge was set for 8:00 A.M., December 30, 1980.

Also on December 22, 1980, Claimant was formally charged with responsibility in connection with "your alleged failure to report for duty at the designated time and place at 6 AM on December 17, 1980, et Port Covington", with investigation set for 9:00 A.M., December 30, 1980.

The **Claimant** did not report for the **investigation** scheduled for 8:00 A.M., December 30, 1980. He had, however, acknowledged receipt of notice scheduling the **investigation** for 8:00 A.M. The **investigation** was conducted in **Claimant's** absence, beginning et 8:25 A.M., following which **Claimant** was assessed discipline of thirty days actual suspension. Award Number 24292 Docket Number CL-24399

**Claimant appeared** for the second investigation, scheduled for9:00 A.&, December 30, 1980. In that investigation it developed that **Claimant's** reason for not reporting for work at the assigned starting time was that he overslept. Following the second investigation, **Claimant** was dismissed from Carrier's service.

Acopy of each of **the investigations** conducted **on** December 30, **1980**, has been **made** a part of the record.

Based upon the record, the Board finds that none of Claimant's substantive procedural rights was violated. His failure to appear at the first investigation, scheduled for 8:00 A.M.December 30, 1980, was of his own volition. Substantial evidence was dducedtbatClafrmnt'stardinesson December 16, 1980, and his failure to report on December 17, 1980, resulted from his oversleeping. Oversleeping is not a valid excuse for tardiness or failure to report for duty. The record also show that Claimant had previously been disciplined on three occasions for similar offenses during his short period of employment, having been hired in March, 1979.

The Organization'submission  $* \square \square **$  that at one time  $\bullet$  ppealwasrmda on the property that **Claimant be reinstated** one **leniency basis.** Any request for leniency **addresses** itself to the **Carrier and** not to this Board.

. The Board does not find that Carrier's actions in imposing the discipline that was imposed to be ● bitrary, capricious, or in bad faith. The claim will bedenied.

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 end 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 disputeinvolved herein; and

That the Agreement was not violsted.

AWARD

Claim denied.

¥° k

Award Number 24292 Docket Number CL-24399

> NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Third Division

Attest: Acting Executive Secretary National Railroad Adjustment Board

۲

By Rosemarie Brasch - Administrative Assistant

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 14th day of April 1983.

Page 3