

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
THIRD DIVISION**

Award No. 41613
Docket No. SG-41287
13-3-NRAB-00003-100158

The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Marty E. Zusman when award was rendered.

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (**Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen**
(**Union Pacific Railroad Company**

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

“Claim on behalf of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Union Pacific Railroad:

Claim on behalf of R. L. Cauley, for two hours at his overtime rate of pay, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen’s Agreement, particularly Rules 16, when it failed to call the Claimant for overtime work at MP 9.6 to MP 10.9 on the Glidden Subdivision, on October 13, 2008, and instead utilized a junior employee causing the Claimant a lost work opportunity. Carrier’s File No. 1513682. General Chairman’s File No. S-16-984. BRS File Case No. 14378-UP.”

FINDINGS:

The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

The carrier or carriers and the employee or employees involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employee within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934.

This Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein.

Parties to said dispute were given due notice of hearing thereon.

The Claimant was assigned and worked on October 13, 2008. On that same date after the Claimant went off duty, overtime was assigned to Herron from 3:00 P.M. until 5:00 P.M. to deal with a gate arm being knocked off of a signal. The Claimant was senior to Herron and did not perform the overtime work. The Organization maintains that this violated the Claimant's seniority rights and Rule 16 of the Agreement. Rule 16A states, in pertinent part:

“Employees assigned to regular maintenance duties recognize the possibility of emergencies in the operation of the railroad, and will notify the person designated by the Management of their regular point of call. When such employees desire to leave such point of call for a period of time in excess of two (2) hours, they will notify the person designated by management that they will be absent, about when they will return, and, when possible, where they may be found. Unless registered absent, the regular assignee will be called, except when unavailable due to rest requirements under the Hours of Service Act”

The Organization maintains that the Claimant was available under the Rule, supra, and not called for the overtime in question. As the senior available employee, he is entitled to the remedy requested.

The Carrier argues that the Rule is inapplicable because there was no trouble call on the claim date. Additionally, the Claimant was offered the overtime and refused it. As the Rule indicates, the “regular assignee will be called . . .” and thereafter inasmuch as the work to be performed was an “emergency” that required immediate action, once the regular assignee is called, the Carrier may contact any available employee (Third Division Awards 38094, 37218 and 37100). Nothing in the Rule obligates the Carrier to call employees in seniority order thereafter. In this instance, the Carrier utilized an available junior employee to work the emergency situation.

A careful review of the Agreement Rule and facts at bar reveals no Agreement violation. Early in the on-property correspondence the Carrier stated that the

Claimant was offered overtime. "Manager Mehta stated the Claimants as well as all the Signal Maintainers are instructed to contact the MSM or the Signal Maintenance Foreman (SMF) if they were available for overtime service." The Carrier stated that the Claimant "did not elect to perform any overtime service on October 13, 2008." While the Organization disputes its receipt of an attachment from the Carrier, the Board notes that the attachment is in the record and that the Carrier correspondence states, "See attached statement of Manager Mehta." Further, even without the attachment, there is substantial evidence that the Claimant was offered the overtime. Additionally, although the Organization submitted a signed document from the Claimant and others alleging that overtime had been handled differently, there was no denial in this record from the Claimant or the Organization that the Claimant was offered the overtime in question. The Board also notes no denial from the Claimant or Organization to the Carrier's allegation:

"It has been the policy for years that [the] employee would let the Carrier know if they were available for overtime. In the instant matter, the Claimant has refused to do so, but now wants to claim it is his work. It should be noted this is the only person filing claims in this terminal because everyone else can follow the policy guidelines."

The facts of this record do not prove a Carrier violation of Rule 16 of the Agreement. Nor do they prove a failure to apply Note 2. There is no proof that the Carrier failed to call the regularly assigned Signal Maintainer of the territory. There is no proof that the Claimant was denied his rights under the Agreement to the work performed. Although the Organization maintains that this was not an "emergency," the evidence of record supports the Carrier's position. The Organization's argument that for almost a decade, seniority was used in the assignment of work and the Claimant was the senior employee available and desiring the work was not proven. At no time did the Claimant submit a statement that either he was not offered, or that he wanted to work the overtime on the date in question. Accordingly, the claim must be denied.

AWARD

Claim denied.

Form 1
Page 4

Award No. 41613
Docket No. SG-41287
13-3-NRAB-00003-100158

ORDER

This Board, after consideration of the dispute identified above, hereby orders that an Award favorable to the Claimant(s) not be made.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 24th day of April 2013.



3-41614

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
THIRD DIVISION**

Award No. 41614
Docket No. SG-41317
13-3-NRAB-00003-100129

The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Marty E. Zusman when award was rendered.

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (**Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen**
(**Union Pacific Railroad Company**

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

“Claim on behalf of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Union Pacific Railroad:

Claim on behalf of J. Juarez for 85 hours at his overtime rate of pay, account the Carrier violated the Current Signalmen’s Agreement, particularly Rule 68(E) when it failed to fully compensate the Claimant backpay for all hours lost when he was held out of service between September 2, 2008 and September 25, 2008. Claimant was exonerated of all charges in connection with an investigation held on September 16, 2008. Carrier’s File No. 1512286. General Chairman’s File No. UPGC-86(E)-004. BRS File Case No. 14300-UP.”

FINDINGS:

The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

The carrier or carriers and the employee or employees involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employee within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934.

This Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein.

Parties to said dispute were given due notice of hearing thereon.

The Claimant was pulled out of service relative to an EEOC charge on September 2, 2008. Subsequent to an Investigation on September 16, 2008, the Claimant was notified that the charges against him had not been sustained. Once the charges were dropped, the Carrier notified the Claimant that the charges would be expunged from his personal record and that he would be paid for all time lost as per Rule 68(e) which states:

“In the event the charge is not sustained, it will be stricken from the record and the employee reinstated if he has been removed from his position, and compensated for his net wage loss.”

The Carrier expunged all record of the incident and paid the Claimant backpay for all time lost.

The Organization argues that during the time that the Claimant was withheld from service, “his gang worked lots of overtime” due to Hurricane Ike, which hit Southern Texas. The Carrier did not fully compensate the Claimant when he was out of service; it only paid the Claimant the straight time wages that he lost; he was not paid for the 85 hours of overtime that he would have worked had he not been withheld from service. The Organization supports its claim by noting that the Carrier does not refute the fact that the Claimant had always accepted overtime on the gang over the several months that he worked. The Claimant submitted a statement asserting that, “Each time I was offered overtime work, I worked it. I would have worked this overtime if I had not been held out of service by the Carrier.” The Organization argues that this is a settled issue, because the Carrier knows when the gang worked overtime and could properly compensate the Claimant. Furthermore, Third Division Award 30987 put it best when it stated:

“It is past time to cease burdening the over-extended resources of this Board with such a claim. By now there should be no doubt that the proper ‘make whole’ remedy for lost overtime work opportunity is payment at the overtime rate. In short, Claimant was entitled to be made whole for the earnings he would have achieved but for Carrier’s admitted violation.”

The Carrier contends that it fulfilled its responsibility to the Agreement when it properly compensated the Claimant at the straight time rate of pay. It argues that there is no support for the request for overtime based on speculation. The Carrier

argues that the Organization failed to support its argument that the Claimant lost work, in that he did not work. The Carrier contends that Awards have long held that the proper rate of compensation for making a Claimant whole is to pay straight time and not overtime in addition to actual lost wages (Public Law Board No. 5531, Award 2; Public Law Board No. 2439, Award 17; Second Division Awards 11003, 10926 and 9237; Public Law Board No. 3199, Award 29).

The Board is aware that the Organization argues that its request for overtime is not speculative, but actual as in Third Division Award 30987. The Board does not agree. Third Division Award 30987 is not on point. It is neither on this property, nor speculative. In that Award, the Claimant should have been called to work five hours of overtime, but although entitled to the overtime, the Carrier violated his rights, assigned an improper employee and then paid straight time arguing that the Claimant never performed the service. There is no speculation in Third Division Award 30987. It is an overtime call. Therein the claimant actually lost overtime pay that he was entitled to receive.

This case does not directly involve overtime. The evidence in this record does not prove either that the Claimant would have been called for overtime, or that he would have performed the work. Nor does it show how the hours were claimed. The Organization presented the fact that "his gang worked lots of overtime" due to the hurricane when the Claimant was withheld from service, but what the Claimant would actually have performed is unknown, speculative, and has had a long list of Awards supporting the language of the Agreement to mean only the pay loss of his usual assignment (Public Law Board No. 3994, Award 6; Public Law Board No. 5531, Award 2; Public Law Board No. 3199, Award 29; Public Law Board No. 4418, Award 26). The Organization has not cited a list of Awards that support its position. As stated by Public Law Board No. 2439, Award 17 interpreting the issue, "Principally because of the speculative nature of requests such as this, it has long been the practice of Boards as well as Divisions of the National Railroad Adjustment Board to consider a proper payment for time not performed as pro rata rather than penalty pay."

Accordingly, the Board will not delve into the realm of equity, but rather will follow the language of the Agreement. Nothing in that language explicitly states that the Claimant is to receive assumed or potentially lost overtime, a calculation averaged or speculated as lost overtime. While the Claimant actually may have and theoretically did lose overtime, the Rule is payment for his normal service assignment. Therefore, the claim must be denied.

AWARD

Claim denied.

ORDER

This Board, after consideration of the dispute identified above, hereby orders that an Award favorable to the Claimant(s) not be made.

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

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 24th day of April 2013.