PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 3134

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: United Transportation Union

V S

Norfolk and Western Railway Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Appeal of Brakeman T. E. Finnerty for reinstatement with full seniority unimpaired, removal of discipline from the record, full pay for all time lost, recovery for the loss of all fringe benefits (current and future), including the monetary value thereof in the case of benefits deemed irreplaceable, and public written apology to Mr. Finnerty from both the Norfolk and Western Rail-way Company as an employer and from Trainmaster J. G. Smith personally and as a representative of the Norfolk and Western England Company for defamation of character and the adverse effect it has had on his standing in the community, his ability to obtain allerts and employment and the general defamatory nature of the action.

CTATEMENT OF FACTS: The facts in this case, mest briefly as road, as that Brakeman L. J. Scott apparently suffered some cort of an on-duty injury. The Carrier's claim Agent, Mr. Savage, had called upon him, whether by appointment or not is not entirely clear, and was attempting to arrange a settlement.

The Claimant at the time was an employee of the Carrier, but off duty because of an injury not railroad connected, since December 2, 1976. Mr. Finnerty also occupied the office of Vice General Chairman, General Committee of Adjustment. Legislative Representative—1036; and had been designated of record is legal counsel by the General Committee (Tr. pages 1-19 and 35). The Board presumes his position as outlined above was the reasons that injured employee, L. J. Scott, approached Mr. Finnerty for advice.

Claim Agent Savage had visited the home of the njured employee, Brakeman Scott, on February 23, 1977
in which time the injured employee Scott informed him he was being recented by Claimant; and again in May, 1977, to ask for a representation of the which, according to such request, was furnished him.

This took place after the injured amployed had talked to the General Chairman about his citual in the had asked his advice on the matter. The General Chairman then remoded that the injured employee, Brokeran Geott, get in teach with it. Chairman the injured employee, and the country, the Vice Chairman and legal rangel; or with the last near recommended UTU counsel.

4/8,000 in - Buck pay

It is the position of the Organization that the representation letter furnished by the injured imployee at the request of Claim Agent Savage was for the purpose of insulating the injured employee from further direct visits. Said representation letter which is reproduced below seems to be the sub-

LAW OFFICES MELANEY & PERKINS & FINHERTY IN KEPERENCE TO: 1033 SOUTH BRADDOCK AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA. 15218 . (412) 241-8130 INTER OFFICE AIRMAIL FIRST CLASS MAIL HOW TO USE THIS FOR MORFOLK & WESTERN RWY. CO. Line Saver LETTER TO SAVE TIME. Claims Department J. J. Ryland, District Claims Agent Type or write your reply in the space below. Then mail BREWSTER, OHIO the white capy to us and keep the pink copy for your files. You'll save time and effort, and we'll have your answer much fester? Thank you. DATE_May_5, 1977 Dear Sir: Flease be advised that I represent L.J. Scott. brakeman - Rook, Pa., IN RE: personal injuries and lost wages due to incident occurring at Rook Yard on December 10, 1976. Kindly address any further questions with regard to this incident to me at the address above. Very truly yours,

Bared upon the above Transmit was formally charged a fellows:

"Brewster, Ohio June 17, 1977

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Timothy E. Finnerty 129 Barnes Street Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15221

Mr. Timothy E. Finnerty:

You are hereby notified to report to the office of the Assistant Superintendent at Rook, Pennsylvania, at 9:00 A.M., Friday, June 24, 1977, for a formal trial to determine the facts and your responsibility in connection with your unfaithfulness and disloyalty to the Nerfolk and Western Railway Company by representing Brakeman L. J. Scott, an employed of this Carrier, as legal counsel in progression of a personal injury claim for reason of 'personal injuries and lost wages due to incident occurring at Rook Yard on December 10, 1976.

"If you desire to have a representative and/or witnesses at the formal trial, please arrange for their presence.

Sincerely,

J. G. Smith Trainmaster

Following witnesses arrange to be present:

Messrs. R. L. Musick

J. J. Ryland

J. R. Savage

Other witnesses may be called."

Subsequent to investigation, the Carrier wrote the Claimant as follows:

"Brewster, Ohio, July 15, 1977

Mr. Timothy E. Finnerty 329 Barnes Street Pittsburgh, Fennsylvania 15221

Dear Sir:

Reference is made to the formal trial held in the Office of the Assistant Superintendent at Rook, Pennsylvania at 9:00 A.M., July 6, 1977, to determine the facts and your responsibility in connection with your unfaithfulness and disloyalty to the Norfolk and Western Railway Company by representing Brakeman L. J. Scott, an employee of this Carrier, as legal counsel in progression of a personal injury claim for reason of 'personal injuries and lost wages due to incident occurring at Rook Yard on December 10, 1976.

For your responsibility as developed in the formal trial, you are hereby assessed discipling of follows:

'DISMISSAL'

Please arrange to return all company property, including switch key, lantern, Book of Rules, etc.

Yours traly,

J. G. Smith Trainmaster

The Board has searched the entire record of the case with great care. The Carrier has the bure in force for support its formal charge "to determine the facts and year responsibility in connection with your unfaithfulness and disloyalty to the Norfolk and Western,..."

The Carrier states in its submission, page 5:
"In view of Claimant's own testimony given at
the trial, it is apparent Claimant represented Brakeman Scott as lead
counsel in the progression of personal injury sait, etc."

However, commencing at page 38 of the transcript, testimony of Claimant is as follows:

- Q. Have you ever talked to Mr. Savage or any other agent for the Norfolk and Western regarding the claim of Mr. Scott?
- A. I have had no personal contact other than the letter that I sent with either Mr. Savage or Mr. Ryland.
- Q. Have you filled suit on behalf of Mr. Scott in the Court of the United State:?
- A. No I have not.
- Q. As a union representative, do you have the right to represent Mr. Scott, whether or not you are an attorney?
- A. It is my understanding of the law that it is my right to so represent Mr. Scott, both as an officer of the court and as an officer of this union.
- Q. And in representing Mr. Scott, did you have any intentions of being disloyal or unfaithful to the Norfolk and Western Railway Company?
- A. None whatsoever. The only alternative I had is representing Mr. Scott was to say that, one, a he had contacted me relative to the visits of the railway chaim agents and knowing that once an attorney had been attained, they would no long a talk to him, it being Mr. Scott's wish that he have no further contact with the railway claim agents as their visits had been unannounced and upset his. He contacted me and asked me if I would get in south with them, which I did with letter, the one in soduced as evidence here.

This evidence does not seem to have been rebut and in the record. There is further evidence in the record that the Claim Department has never contacted Mr. Finnerty and a representative for Mr. Scott on his personal injury claim. Tr., page 40. The is evidence that the Claimant was never notified be would not be parallely to handle railroad claims as an attorney.

There is no widence Claimans ever entered into an attorney and client contract or fee arrangement r that there was an appearance in court or even conferences. The Claimant bases his right to counsel Brake can Scott, which is all the record shows he actually did do, according to his union job and reponsibility. He relied for his justification upon UTU vs Virginia, 177 US 1 which in a reasonably similar case, the Supreme Court said:

"It cannot be seriously doubted that the First Amendment's guarantees of True speech, petition and assembly give railroad workers the right to gather together for the lawful purpose of helping and advising one another in asserting the rights Congress gave them in the Safety Appliance Act and the Federal Employers' Liability Act, statutory rights which would be vain and futile if the workers could not talk together freely as to the best course to follow. The right of members to consult with each other in a fraternal organization necessarily includes the right to select a spokesman from their number who could be expected to give the wisest counsel. That is the role played by the members who carry out the legal aid Propers. And the right of the workers personally or through a special department of their Brotherwood to advise concerning the need for legal assistance -- and, most importantly, what lawyer a member could confidently rely on -- is an inseparable part of this constitutionally guaranteed right to assist and advise each other."

This seems to cover about any actions that the record shows had been engaged in by Mr. Finne ty up to the time of the investigation. There is no chowing that the course been any detriment to the Carrier.

The Board is not convinced that the Carrier suctained its burden of proof that Mr. Finner y represented Mr. Scott in a legal action again to the Carrier.

AWARD:

Claim sustained in that Claimant Finnerty is reinstated to his previous position with full ceniority unimpaired and removal of said discipline from his record, together with pay for time lost from August 1, 1977, which the record shows was the date he was able to return to work from sick leave. The Board has no authority to go into apologies, and cert in their extraneous matters mentioned in the obtain.

*PLB218*4 Case No. 1 - page 7

Carrier is ordered to make this award effective within thirty days.

Leverett Edwards, Chairman and Neutral

1. W. Jealing
Lir the Employees

For the Carrier Cinat

Cleveland, Ohio

Verentea 21, 1978