## PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 1368

PARTIES) THE COLORADO AND VIYOMING RAILWAY COMPANY
TO )
DISPUTE) BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYEES

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

FINDINGS: This Public Law Board No. 1368 finds that the parties mirrorn are Carrier and Employee within the meening of the Railway Liber Act, as amended, and that this Board has jurisdiction.

In this dispute the claimant was dismissed from the service of the Carrier for being insubordinate in that he refused to protect  $\nu$  als assignment for the remainder of the work day on May 31, 1975.

The firsts of record indicate that at 7:00 a.m. on May 31 claimant mapared for work, and at the start of his assignment advised the assistant general track foremen that because of personal brainess 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 hater 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 determ of the necessity of his being off that afternoon or the lay lallowing, but his request was refused. The claimant there-tips abounded to see the general superintendent.

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

The claimant valked off the job at 3:00 p.m. and did not perform the overtime. Upon reporting for work Monday, June 3 the claimant was calcided that his failure to work the overtime was tantamented to make and that he would not be permitted to perform world.

The chainmat was reinstated to his position June 19, pending an imposungation, and was notified that there would be an investigation on Triday, June 21. After the investigation the Carrier determined that the plaining was guilty and suspended him for six, weaths for his limiter to complete the overtime on May 31.

Amard No. 2 Paga 2

At the outset, the Agreement between the parties does not provide \ for suspension pending an investigation, and the claim for June 3 to Sune 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 harsh, arbitrary and unjust. ""

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.

ATTARD: Claim sustained as per above.

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

Preston J / loors

CONTROL OF STANSE

Carrior Lander

D 62602308

francillo, Terros July LJ, 1973