FUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 2439

Award No. 112 Case No. 112

PARTIES. TO DISPUTE Brotherhood of Maintenance of Wav Employes and

Southern Facific Transportation Company (Western Lines)

OF CLAIM:

- STATEMENT "1. The Carrier violated the provisions of the current Agreement when it dismissed Track Foreman Paul Williams from its service on the basis of unproven charges said action being in abuse of discretion.
 - 2. Carrier shall now exonerate Mr. Williams of all charges and reinstate him to his former posision with the Carrier with seniority and all other rights restored unimoaired and compensate him for all wade loss suffered."

FINDINGS

Upon the whole record. After hearing, the Board finds that the $__$ parties herein are Carrier and Employees within the meaning of -the Railway Labor Act, as amended, and that this Board is duly constituted under Fublic Law 89-456 and has jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter.

Claimant herein was employed by Carrier in 1971. He had been prompted to an exempt position as Roadmaster in Los Angeles at the Taylor yard. On February 23. 1986 he was removed from service while serving as Roadmaster and then exercised his rights under the current Agreement as a Track Foreman. He worked two days in that position and then he was again removed from service at the conclusion of the formal hearing held on February 13, 1986. That

hearing resulted in Carrier believing that he was quilty of the charges which specified that he had allegedly accepted compensation from an outside firm in the amount of \$1300 for track repair work on the sour track in this outside concern's property and also for allegedly falsifying a Carrier questionnaire on February 12, 1982. For these infractions he dismissed from service.

Carrier alleges that the record is clear that Claimant provided men and repairs without authority to an outside industry in company's spur tracks using Carrier's personnel repair of that and equipment for that purpose. He then retained the proceeds that work in addition to falsifying the questionnaire. Carrier also indicates that the district Maintenance of Manager (since retired) and Carrier's Material Planner (also retired) were involved with Claimant in this fraudulent activity. The work in question was performed on May 11. 1981, and the questionnaire was filled out some six months later. Carrier believes that the dishonesty explicit in this transaction by a trusted supervisor is wholly intolerable and the claim should be denied. ._ .

Petitioner insists that the sole evidence that the Carrier used was a cancelled check made bayable to Claimant and deposited in his bank account. That obeck which was admitted by Claimant was

- =

never explained fully in the hearing by either party. According to Fetitioner there is no evidence whatever that Claimant performed any work for the outside company whatsoever. Furthermore. Fetitioner notes that it took nearly five years for Carrier to bring charges against Claimant which made a proper defense almost impossible.

A careful examination of the record of this case involves obscure testimony and considerable confusion. It is evident that the Claimant did indeed receive a check even though he disclaims it at this time and it was during a period of knowledge of personal difficulty unrelated to his work activities. He insists that the check constituted a loan from the former district Maintenance of Wav Manager. In view of the nature of the evidence in this dispute and the type of transgression involved, the Board reluctantly must assume that Carrier has failed to establish clearly the basis for its decision and discipline. Even though Claimant obviously used at best poor judament in accepting for whatever purposes some five years prior to the investigation, that does not establish the fraud which Carrier sudgests was involved. While the Board is aware of Carrier's concern and proper action with respect to dishonesty of any kind. it is particularly appropriate when_ a supervisor and trusted employee is involved. In this instance, however, in view of Petitioner's long service with Carrier and the obscurity of

offense, it is believed that dismissal was excessive as a penalty. It is this Board's judgment that Petitioner should be reinstated to his former position as a Track Foreman but receive no pay for time lost. That time lost together with his demotion from an officer's status is a sufficient penalty for the at least poor judgment that he used in 1782. He should never again be a position where any question concerning his integrity is raised or, if that did occur, dismissed forthwith.

AWARD

Claim sustained in part. Claimant should be reinstated to his former position of Track Foreman with all rights and seniority unimpaired but without compensation for time lost which shall be considered to have been a penalty for his transpression.

ORDER

Carrier will comply with the Award herein within thirty (30) days of the date hereof.

I. M. Lieberman. Weutral-Chairman

HV. Moles.

Carrier Member

C. F. Foose.

Employee Member

San Francisco. California

Jere 3. 1988