

**Award No. 9843**

**Docket No. PM-9742**

**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 E. L. Stanley, E. L. Stanley, J. Williams #5, A. Leonard, A. Anderson, G. J. Chase, K. D. Leufroy, G. J. Chase, E. H. Simon, D. Johnson, and U. P. Jupiter, who are now, and for a number of years past have been, employed by The Pullman Company as porters operating out of the District of New Orleans, Louisiana.

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 E. J. O'Neil of the New Orleans 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 New Orleans 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 O'Neill of the New Orleans District.

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

Your Petitioner further sets forth that it is duly authorized to represent E. L. Stanley, J. Williams #5, L. Leonard, et al, for and in whose behalf these claims were filed with your Honorable Board, and as set forth in our Statement of Claim, said parties being now, and having been for some time past, employed by The Pullman Company as porters operating out of New Orleans, Louisiana.

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 employees 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 employees "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 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 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**