

NATIONAL RAILROAD **ADJUSTMENT** BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 25441
Docket Number MS-25396

M. David Vaughn, Referee

(James William Ramsey III

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(Southern Pacific Transportation Company (Western Lines)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

- '1. Job Foreman's position, Gang 4, San Jose, went up for bid November 5, 1981, then awarded to William **Lusch**, junior employee. Claimant Ramsey, returned to **work** December 2, 1981. then placed proper bid, met all requirements, but wasn't awarded job. Violated all and parts of rules 7, 8, 10 and 12. Due to the fact that improper placement occurred, claimant was left without protected position which resulted in my being displaced improperly.
2. Mr. Juan Ayala. a composite mechanic, who, due to force reduction, was **bumped** again. Then his attemp (**sic**) to exercise seniority was denied. In return, claimant Ramsey was displaced improperly and will prove it is in violation of all or parts of rules 7, 8. 10. 12 and 13.
 - A. **Why** was Ramsey not allowed to advance on two occasions in order to protect him, a senior employee, from displacement during force reductions?
 - B. **Why** was Ayala denied the opportunity to **displacr (sic)** a junior employee but allowed to bump Ramsey, who is junior to Ayala. **However**, Ramsey is senior to others who remained and allowed to work during force reductions."

OPINION OF BOARD: Claimant was, at the time of the claim, employed by the Carrier as a Water Service Mechanic Class **"A"**. On December 2, 1981, Claimant returned to duty pursuant to the Award of a Public Law Board. Curing his absence, **a**Foreman's **position** for which Claimant might have been eligible was posted and filled. Claimant's bid for the position was rejected, and Claimant continued to hold the position of Water Service Mechanic Class **"A"** on Track Gang No. 4 from the date of his return to duty until June 25, 1982.

On May 28, 1982, employee J. **Ayala**. a composite mechanic who also held seniority in the same classification as Claimant and who had more total and class seniority than Claimant, was notified that his position was being abolished. That employe applied Rule **13(b)** of the applicable Agreement to displace a second employe who held the position of Water **Service** Mechanic Class **"A"** on Water Service Gang No. 3. When additional reductions in force occurred approximately one month later, Ayala again exercised his seniority under Rule **13(b)** and displaced Claimant, who lacked displacement rights to any position then filled. Claimant was, therefore, furloughed **after** June 25, 1982.

Rule **13(b)** states that an employe exercises displacement rights in the following **order**:

- *1. First, displace any employe in the **same class** who is junior to him in seniority.
2. Second, if there is no junior employe within that class, displace any junior employe in any other class in which he has established seniority..

Claimant's Organization filed on his behalf a claim that Claimant's displacement was not proper under Rule **13(b)** and that Claimant was, therefore, entitled to pay for all time lost as a result of the displacement and restoration of all benefits. The Organization and the Carrier **were** unsuccessful in resolving the dispute, and Claimant brought his claim to the Board.

The Carrier argues initially before the Board that the assertion that Claimant's displacement was improper as a result of the Carrier's failure to award him the Foreman position is not properly before the **Board** because it 'was not raised below and progressed in the usual **manner**, as required by Section 153, First (**i**) of the Railway Labor **Act**. Indeed, a review of the claim and appeal on the property and the Carrier's responses thereto reveals no reference to the Carrier's failure to award to Claimant the Foreman position.

Board precedent is clear that issues not handled on the property before being brought to the Board have not been handled 'in the usual manner. and must be dismissed as outside the **Board's** jurisdiction. See, e.g., Third Division Awards 25131, 24470, 20975, 20472, 20456, and 15063. Accordingly, that portion of the claim which asserts relief based upon the Carrier's failure to select Claimant **as** Foreman must be, and it is, dismissed.

Since the assertions raised in the second paragraph of the claim were a part of the claim presented on the property and progressed in the usual manner, that portion of the claim is properly before the Board.

Claimant does not contest **Ayala's** seniority date, which is greater than Claimant's and **would**, under the Agreement, give **Ayala** displacement rights if he held his seniority in the same classification. Rather, Claimant contends first, that Ayala did not hold seniority in Claimant's classification and, second, **that** Ayala could have bumped someone else but was directed by the Carrier to bump Claimant for reasons of discrimination or personal revenge.

The Claimant asserted that Ayala held seniority as a Composite Mechanic and was obligated to exhaust his seniority in that classification prior to bumping into the Water Mechanic **"A"** classification. The Carrier responded that Ayala had established seniority in the Water Mechanic **"A"** classification and had properly exercised his seniority to bump into that classification as a result of a reduction which occurred one **month** before the reduction in which he displaced Claimant. The **Carrier asserts before the Board**, and the record **supports, that** **Ayala** held the classification of Water Mechanic **"A"**, with greater seniority than Claimant, at the time Ayala displaced Claimant.

Claimant, upon whom the burden of proof rests with respect to all **aspects** of his claim, including showing that Ayala did not hold seniority in the Water Service Mechanic **"A"** classification, presents no evidence to the contrary. Accordingly, the Board concludes, for purposes of this claim, that Ayala had established seniority in the same classification as Claimant and had greater seniority than Claimant. The Board holds, therefore, that under Rule **13(b)** Ayala was entitled to displace Claimant.

Claimant argues, in addition, that Ayala had more than one position into which he could have bumped under Rule 13(b), but that Carrier officials instructed or encouraged Ayala to displace Claimant. Claimant asserts that, in so instructing Ayala, the Carrier was motivated by personal animosity or discrimination against him. There is, however, no support in the record either for the assertion that Rule **13(b)** must be exercised in a particular manner or that the Carrier's instruction or encouragement of Ayala, if any, was improper. Indeed, the right under Rule **13(b)** belonged to Ayala, to exercise as he chose, to bump any employee with less seniority. There is no support for the proposition **that Ayala was** required to exercise that right in a way which favored Claimant.

In addition, the Board finds no credible support in the record for the proposition that the Carrier was discriminating against Claimant on the basis of race or any other invidious factor. Rather, the record shows a legitimate exercise by another employee of Rule **13(b)** displacement rights, with adverse impact on Claimant as a result of his lower seniority. The Board accepts Claimant's assertion that he believes he was discriminated against, but belief without support is not sufficient to sustain Claimant's burden of proof. Claimant's claim that he was improperly displaced because of **Ayala's** exercise of his seniority under Rule **13(b)** must be, and it is, denied.

Accordingly, the Board dismisses that portion of the claim which asserts that Claimant was improperly displaced as a result of the Carrier's failure to promote him to Foreman; and the Board denies that portion of his claim which asserts that Claimant was improperly displaced because of misapplication of the seniority rules.

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 **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** 25441
Docket **Number** MS-25396

Page 4

A W A R D

Claim denied.

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

Attest: 
Nancy J. Devel - Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 30th day of April 1985.