

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD**

**THIRD DIVISION**

**Raymond E. LaDriere, Referee**

---

**PARTIES TO DISPUTE:**

**BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS**

**THE PULLMAN COMPANY**

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM:** \* \* \* for and in behalf of J. Mangrum, J. Mangrum, S. E. Vickers, A. L. Lewis, J. Ellis, S. Chandler, E. Brooks, J. E. Beal, L. B. Smith, J. Mangrum, J. Mangrum, J. Ellis, J. Ellis, W. C. Daniel, J. R. Curry, L. R. Bright, E. Berry, E. Berry, J. V. Williams, E. W. Thomas, L. L. Denison, W. C. Daniel, E. Berry, E. Brooks, E. W. Thomas, E. Self, J. Mangrum, W. Duckett, W. C. Daniel, S. Chandler, S. Chandler, L. R. Bright, J. V. Williams, E. W. Thomas, E. Self, P. Sallie, U. Patton, U. Patton, E. Young, H. Miller, S. Chandler, J. Mangrum, and D. Goldstein, who are now, and for some years past have been, employed by The Pullman Company as porters operating out of the District of Dallas, Texas.

Because The Pullman Company did finally, through Appeals Officer W. W. Dodds of The Pullman Company, deny the claims filed for and in behalf of the above-mentioned porters through Superintendent L. W. Berry of the Dallas District, in which claims the Organization maintained that the Agreement between The Pullman Company and its Porters, Attendants, Maids and Bus Boys, represented by the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, was violated in connection with the operation of the above-mentioned employees out of the Dallas District in that it deprived them of certain work to which they were entitled under the rules of the above-mentioned Agreement, particularly under Rule 43 (b).

And further, for the above-mentioned porters, employees of The Pullman Company to be paid such sums of money as was lost by them in the wages that they would have earned had not the Agreement been violated as set forth in said claims which were filed for and in behalf of the above-mentioned porters through Superintendent Berry of the Dallas District.

**EMPLOYES' STATEMENT OF FACTS:** Your Petitioner, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, respectfully submits that it is duly authorized to represent all the porters, attendants, maids and bus boys employed by The Pullman Company as it is provided for under the Railway Labor Act.

In such capacity it is duly authorized to represent Porters J. Mangrum, S. E. Vickers, A. L. Lewis, et al, who are now, and for some time past have

according to the Board, are not "fixed" and these employes are not entitled to adjustments.

In the case at hand the initial assignment on each of the 43 dates involved is the specific assignment performed by the regular porter. Also, in the case at hand, on each date of violation, the proper claimant is the extra porter who would have received the assignment given the regular porter. The 43 claimants named by the Organization did not lose the assignments performed by the regular assigned men and are thus not entitled to adjustments.

The Pullman Company also wishes to call the attention of the Board to the fact that a dispute involving the same principle as the instant dispute has recently been adjudicated by National Mediation Board Special Board of Adjustment No. 155, which Board settled certain controversies between the Great Northern Railway Company and the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen. This Board was composed of Mr. D. F. McMahon (Chairman and Neutral Member), Mr. C. A. Pearson (Carrier Member) and Mr. L. E. Downing (Organization Member). Of significance is Docket No. 55, in which docket, as in the instant case, a claim was filed in behalf of an employe who did not stand "first-out" on the extra list and who would not have performed the specific assignment given the wrong employe. The Special Board of Adjustment denied the claim on the sole basis that it was not filed in behalf of the proper claimant. The Award of the Special Board of Adjustment in Docket No. 55, dated April 15, 1957, is attached as Exhibit H.

#### CONCLUSION

In this ex parte submission, The Pullman Company has shown that the Organization filed claims in behalf of 50 employes as a consequence of the Company's violations of Rule 43 (b) of the working Agreement. The Company has shown that it has allowed claims in behalf of 7 of the employes named, but has not compensated the remaining employes on the basis that they were not the proper claimants. Further, the Company has shown that Management's position in this dispute is supported by practice, by Awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and by an Award of a Special Board of Adjustment. Finally, the Company has shown that the Organization's position is based upon an erroneous interpretation of Award 7142, which Award, when analyzed, supports the Company's position.

The Organization's claim is without merit and should be denied.

All data submitted herewith in support of the Company's position have heretofore been submitted in substance to the employes and their representatives and made a part of this dispute.

(Exhibits not reproduced.)

**OPINION OF BOARD:** In this case, as we held in Award 9687, Elkouri:

"The only issue that is involved herein as the case was processed by the Organization on the property and before this Board, is whether the particular individuals (extra Porters) designated by the Organization as claimants were proper claimants entitled to

compensation adjustments by virtue of Carrier's action in prematurely placing regularly assigned Porters on the extra list. \* \* \*

Moreover, the Organization emphasized that issue by a statement and also the filing of Exhibit E before the Board. In so doing it asserted that said exhibit had been filed in Docket PM-9648 (later covered by Award 9687) for a group of employes "who have filed claims identical with those filed in the instant case" and that the "principle" involved in all these claims is "identical".

As the record shows that the parties agree that the claims (except in name and amounts), principles and arguments are identical with those covered by Award 9687, this Board should follow its action at that time and dismiss the same.

**FINDINGS:** The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, after giving the parties to this dispute due notice of hearing thereon, and upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

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 claim must be dismissed for reasons stated in the Opinion.

#### AWARD

Claim dismissed.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of THIRD DIVISION

ATTEST: S. H. Schulty  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 17th day of February, 1961.

#### LABOR MEMBERS DISSENT TO AWARDS 9841, 9842, 9843 DOCKETS PM-9740, PM-9741, PM-9742

My dissent to Award 9840, Docket PM-9739, applies equally here and is by reference repeated.

H. C. Kohler  
Labor Member  
National Railroad Adjustment Board  
Third Division

#### CARRIER MEMBERS' REPLY TO LABOR MEMBER'S DISSENTS TO AWARDS 9840, 9841, 9842 and 9843

These Awards, along with Award 9687 which they followed in dismissing the instant claims, all involving the same parties, agreement, rules and issue, specifically provide, in clear and unambiguous language, and notwithstanding

that the named claimants might have lost or actually did lose money because of Carrier's violation of a rule, that the only proper claimant, if any, under the rules and practices in effect on this property, is the one porter directly affected by the violation.

/s/ **W. H. Castle**

/s/ **R. A. Carroll**

/s/ **P. C. Carter**

/s/ **D. S. Dugan**

/s/ **J. F. Mullen**