FUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 1368

PARATES) THE COLORADO AND VYONING RAILWAY COMPANY

DISPUTE) BEOTHERWOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF MAY EMPLOYEES

CONTINUENT OF CLAIM: Claim of M. Johnson for pro rate rate of pay for pariod July 1, 1974 through December 31, 1974.

TTOTTES: This Public Law Board No. 1368 finds that the parties aftern are Carrier and Employee within the meaning of the Pailton Labor Act, as amended, and that this Board has jurisdiction.

In this dispute the claimant was dismissed from the service of the Carrier for boing insubordinate in that he refused to protect ν als assignment for the remainder of the work day on May 31, 1974.

The facts of record indicate that at 7:00 a.m. on May 31 claimant maported for work, and at the start of his assignment advised the assistant general track foreman that because of personal business in would be unable to perform evertime work following the regular assignment on that date.

This information was transmitted to the general track foreman but helder in the day the decision was made that overtime had to be worked. When the claimant was notified of this decision, he stated what he could work either the afternoon of May 31 or the following day, Caturday, June 1, but he must be off one of those days.

In about 2:30 p.m. the claiment again advised the general track forces of the necessity of his being off that afternoon or the lay following, but his request was refused. The claiment theretyon abbumpted to see the general superintendent.

The scaing or not seeing the general superintendent would have no bearing upon this natter, because the orders of the assistant constal track foreman and the general track foreman are all that is involved.

The claiment walked off the job at 3:00 p.m. and did not perform the evertime. Upon reporting for work Monday, June 3 the claiment and claimed that his failure to work the overtime was tantamented to perform work.

The claiment was reinstated to his position June 19, pending an improvingution, and was notified that there would be an investigation of Thilipy, June 21. After the investigation the Carrier determined that the plaining was guilty and suspended him for singmonths for his lunium to complete the overtime on May 31.

Amard No. 2 Page 2

At the outset, the Agreement between the parties does not provide of for suspension pending an investigation, and the claim for June 3 to June 19, 1974 is valid.

The Board has exemined all of the evidence of record, and under the circumstances it appears to the Board that any disciplina assessed in excess of 90 days is horsh, arbitrary and unjust. In 50 days is the maximum amount of time which could be justified for the action taken herein and all of the circumstances surrounding this incident.

Therefore the claim will be sustained from June 3 to June 19, 1974 " and for the months from October 1 to December 31, 1974.

ATTATE: Claim sustained as per above.

COUR: The Carrier is directed to comply with this award within thereby days from the date of this award.

Prooton J. J. 6624

ingeneración fichar

Currier honour

೨ ಬಾದಲಾಗಾಗಿ

franklio, Tomas July Li, 1973