## AWARD NO. 202 Case No. 202

Organization File No. B16167413 Carrier File No. 2013-149799

## PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 7163

PARTIES	) BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYES DIVISION,
	) INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS
TO	
DISPUTE	) CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.

## STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

- 1. The Agreement was violated when, on August 16, 17 and 18, 2013, the Carrier assigned Track Inspector M. Campbell and Lubricator Maintainer C. Wilson to fill an assistant foreman flagman temporary vacancy on the Jacksonville Seniority District and failed to properly offer preference for such to Claimant R. Mamula.
- 2. As a consequence of the violation referred to in Part 1 above, Claimant R. Mamula shall be ". . . allowed eight (8) hours straight time and thirty seven (37) hour (sic) overtime. . . ."

## FINDINGS:

The Board, upon consideration of the entire record and all of the evidence, finds that the parties are Carrier and Employee within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, that this Board is duly constituted by Agreement dated March 20, 2008, this Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein, and that the parties were given due notice of the hearing held.

On August 16, 17 and 18, 2013 the Carrier had need for the services of a flagman to provide protection for contractors between Mile Posts SX 826.3 and SX 832.7 in the vicinity of Auburndale, Florida. The Carrier utilized employees who were junior in seniority to Claimant. The Organization has presented this claim, asserting that Claimant should have been assigned to perform this work

PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 7163 AWARD NO. 202

PAGE 2

based upon his seniority. The Carrier has denied the claim, arguing that Claimant was not qualified

on this territory. The Organization does not dispute the fact that Claimant was not qualified.

This case presents the same factual situation that was addressed in Award No. 199 of this

Board. In that case, we held that the Carrier had no obligation to use an employee who was not

qualified. We further held that Claimant could have addressed his concerns about the Carrier's

refusal to qualify him under other provisions of the Agreement. For the reasons given in Award

No. 199, we find that the Agreement was not violated.

AWARD:

Claim denied.

Barry E. Simon

Chairman and Neutral Member

Andrew Mulford

Employee Member

Rob Miller

Carrier Member

Dated:

Arlington Heights, Illinois