PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 1760

Award No. 142

Case No. 142 File MWDECR-92-1

Parties Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

to and

Dispute Norfolk and Western Railway Company

(former Wabash)

Statement

of Claim: L. C. Brown - Dismissal - Failure to report and falsifying

injury.

Findings: The Board has jurisdiction by reason of the parties

Agreement establishing this Board therefor.

The Claimant, Machine Operator L. C. Brown, was notified to attend a formal investigation on March 19th:

"To determine your responsibility, if any, in connection with your falsification of an injury, in that by a letter dated February 24, 1992 this office was informed by our claim department that you had instituted a law suit and a claim against the railroad company for personal injuries arising from an incident on August 8, 1991. Further, in that no injury report was filed, you are additionally charged with violation of General Rule N and Rule 1000..."

Carrier concluded therefrom that the Claimant was culpable. He was dismissed from service as discipline therefor.

Claimant was accorded the due process to which entitled under his discipline rule.

There was sufficient evidence adduced from the investigation to support the Carrier's conclusion of his culpability. The record shows that as a result of the Claimant's wife calling the Track Supervisor's office to advise that Claimant would not be into work because of a doctor's appointment on two days, two supervisors went to his home to see him and they found him at a cousin's home. Claimant advised his supervisors on August 27, 1991 that he had hurt his back working on a friend's roof and he willingly wrote out a statement to that effect and gave it to his supervisors.

Track Supervisor White was advised that the Claimant had retained an attorney concerning an alleged August 8,

1991, on duty injury. Track Supervisor White had no knowledge of said alleged injury. An injury report form arrived at said supervisor's office on March 10, 1992. Thus, with the Claimant's admission that the Carrier's first knowledge would have been through his attorney's contact in February 1992, it is clear that no incident had been reported reasonably timely. Therefore, the Carrier was denied the prompt opportunity to determine the cause and to take any necessary corrective action to prevent any future reoccurrences as well as preparing for any potential liabilities.

Despite the demonstration of Claimant's apparent dishonest action a dismissal award based on the facts in this case might be deemed reasonable. In spite of the demonstration of Claimant's dishonesty he has resigned from all service of the Carrier. His release in part states:

"Case No. MWDECR-92-01-LM-31... he represents that he will request and authorize his collective bargaining agent to cancel, terminate, and withdraw said claim and appeal."

The above withdrawal of the claim occurred after the claim had been presented to the Board. It will be denied on its merits.

Award: Claim denied.

· *()*

ée Member

ur T. Van Wart, Chairman

and Neutral Member