

PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 7633

Brotherhood of Maintenance
of Way Employees Division - IBT

and

Union Pacific Railroad Company
(Former Missouri Pacific Railroad Company)

Case No: 152
Award No: 152

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood that:

1. The Carrier's discipline (dismissal) of Mr. F. Rubio, by letter dated October 9, 2019, for alleged violation of Rules 1.6: Conduct – Dishonest, 1.13: Reporting and Complying with Instructions, SSI Item 10-1: Union Pacific Railroad Policies and Rule 1.6 Conduct – which reads: 'Any act of hostility, misconduct, or willful disregard or negligence affecting the interest of the company or its employees is cause for dismissal and must be reported.' was severe, harsh, imposed without the Carrier having met its burden of proof and in violation of the Agreement (System File UP522JF19/1729773 MPR).
2. As a consequence of the violation referred to in Part 1 above, we request:

‘... the Discipline of Dismissal to be removed, and removed from the Claimant's Personnel Record to be reinstated to active service. Also, to be paid and compensated for any and all lost time at the Claimant's respective straight time rate of pay, and any and all overtime to be paid at his respective overtime rate of pay that Gang # 4150 was afforded, and the employee performing the Claimant's work had he not been unjustly, and excessively disciplined. Also, to include any and all holiday, Any, and all lost time to be credited to Railroad Retirement, Hospitalization, to include physician office visits etc., dental, prescriptions, and vision to begin on August 13, 2019, through and including on a continuous basis until this matter is settled. Also, to include any and all expenses Mr. Rubio may have acquired, to include meals, lodging, and mileage at the negotiated rate of \$.58 cents a mile from Mr. Rubio's place of residence, 1707 CR 400, Uvalde, Texas 78801 to the San Antonio Hampton Brooks City Base Landing, San Antonio, Texas, and returning to Mr. Rubio's place of residence for his attendance at the Formal investigation scheduled for September 24, 2019 at 1 :00 P. M. , account the Carrier unjustly, and excessively charged and disciplined the Claimant without sufficient and supportive evidence, not affording him a "Fair and Impartial Investigation", forcing him in a worse position and causing him a loss of work opportunity, loss of wages, causing him financial hardship.

* * *

The Organization also requests that within such time in which the Claimant is reinstated back to active service he would not be subject to any additional probation under Union Pacific Maps Policy, specifically “Rule 3.7 Arbitration Decision” in which case the Carrier can revert employees status to a second triggering/training event with a thirty-six (36) month retention period.’ (Employees’ Exhibit ‘A-3’).”

FINDINGS

Public Law Board No. 7633, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds the parties involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employees within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as amended; this Board has jurisdiction of the dispute herein; the parties were given due notice of hearing before this Board and they participated therein.

The Claimant was disciplined pursuant to a Notice of Investigation dated August 16, 2019, Investigation held September 24, 2019, “... to develop the facts and place your responsibility, if any, in connection with the below charge.

On 08/13/2019 the Carrier gained knowledge that during the month of July 2019 you allegedly falsified your worksite reporting location which allowed you to gain per diem for which you were not entitled to. This is a possible violation of the following rule(s) and/or policy:

Rule 1.6: Conduct – Dishonest
Rule 1.13: Reporting and Complying with Instructions
SSI Item 10-I: Union Pacific Railroad Policies
Rule 1.6: Conduct- which reads:

“Any act of hostility, misconduct, or willful disregard or negligence affecting the interest of the company or its employees is cause for dismissal and must be reported.”

Under the MAPS Policy, this violation is a Dismissal event. Based upon your current status, if you are found to be in violation of this alleged charge, Dismissal may result.

In a discipline letter dated October 9, 2019, the Carrier found that “... after carefully considering the evidence adduced at the hearing, I find that the evidence more than substantially supports the charges against you. The following charge has been sustained:

On 08/13/2019, while employed as a Welder, the Carrier gained knowledge that during the month of July 2019, you falsified your worksite reporting location which allowed you to gain per diem for which you were not entitled to. This is a violation of the following rule(s) and/or policy:

1.6: Conduct - Dishonest
1.13: Reporting and Complying with Instructions
SSI Item 10-I: Union Pacific Railroad Policies
Rule 1.6: Conduct - which reads:

“Any act of hostility, misconduct, or willful disregard or negligence affecting the interest of the company or its employees is cause for dismissal and must be reported. Indifference to duty or to the performance of duty will not be tolerated.”

Based on your current record, you are hereby dismissed from all service with the Union Pacific Railroad.

The Organization appealed the discipline and the Carrier denied the appeals. The dispute was not resolved during a settlement conference and progressed to arbitration. This matter is now before the Board for final and binding resolution. The Board has carefully reviewed the entire record in this case, including the arguments and awards provided in support of the parties’ respective positions, whether or not specifically addressed herein.

The Organization raised Rule 22(c)(1) “precise charges” procedural violation defenses to the Notice of Investigation. Under the facts and circumstances of this case, the Board finds this persuasive with respect to the charge: “SSI Item 10-1: Union Pacific Railroad Policies”. Rule 22(c)(1) of the parties’ Agreement requires the Carrier to provide “... precise charges sufficiently in advance...” of the Investigation. Said charge fails to meet said requirement. Consequently, the Board excludes the charge, and the policies admitted into the record in support of the charge.

The Organization raised a number of Rule 22(a)(1) “fair and impartial hearing” procedural violation defenses to the Carrier’s Corporate Audit “Special Investigation – Theft of Time and Per Diem” in this case. The Board notes that in Award 45, PLB 7633 held, in pertinent part, that “Rule 22 is not intended and cannot be read to include investigations by Corporate Audit. Therefore the Claimant was not authorized a duly accredited representative when questioned by Corporate Audit.” Evidence from Corporate Audits, including those conducted telephonically, has been accepted by PLB 7633. This includes bargaining unit member statements and/or admissions allegedly made during Corporate Audits.

The Board notes however, that in such cases the Rule 22 Investigation record included a Corporate Audit transcript. The Investigation record in this case does not. Corporate Audit’s conclusory summarizations and characterizations of alleged Audit statements and/or admissions are unsupported by


Audit transcript. Additionally, at the Investigation Claimant denied making key alleged Audit statements and/or admissions which at the Investigation the Carrier attributed to Claimant.

The Board finds that under the facts and circumstances of this record, the Carrier's Rule 22 Investigation use of alleged Corporate Audit statements and/or admissions, unsupported by Audit transcript, violated the "fair and impartial hearing" requirement memorialized by the parties in Agreement Rule 22(a)(1). Consequently, the Board excludes from the record alleged Corporate Audit statements and/or admissions, and evidence derived therefrom.

Upon detailed review of the remaining charges and record, the Board finds that there is not substantial evidence in the record to uphold the Carrier's determination of culpability.

AWARD

Claim sustained. Pursuant to Rule 22(f) of the parties' Agreement Claimant is reinstated to service at Claimant's former position, with full seniority unimpaired, and afforded the remedy provided therein. Claimant's record shall not contain any MAPS status pertaining to this matter. The Carrier is directed to comply with this Award on or before 30 days following the date by which any two members of the Board have affixed their signatures hereto.


Robert Grey
Neutral Member


Christopher Bogenreif
Carrier Member


John Schlismann
Organization Member

January 19, 2022

Dated