

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee Files Nos. 234, 246, 335 and 343
De Sabla Division Grievances Nos. 64, 65, 81 and 82

Subject of the Grievances

The four grievances received from the De Sabla Division concern the question of temporary upgrade of a Senior Warehouseman and a Warehouseman during the absence of the Storekeeper A in Chico Warehouse. The employees concerned in the grievances contend that during the absence of the Storekeeper they have performed the duties of the respective higher classifications. The file notes that the grievants were supervised by the Division Storekeeper during the absence of the Storekeeper A, and also noted that some time prior to the filing of the first grievances that it had been the practice of the Division to upgrade the grievants during the absence of the Storekeeper A. The Division contends, however, that prior to the incidents involved in these grievances the employees had been told that they would not be so upgraded in the future.

Discussion

While this case has been before the Review Committee the Division was requested to conduct a further investigation relative to the work assignments made to the grievants when the incidents complained of occurred. The Local Investigating Committee has furnished the Review Committee with certain information concerning the work performed by the grievants at these times. There still remains a controversy whether the employees assumed the work performed by the Storekeeper A and the Senior Warehouseman respectively or whether they were directed to perform such work.

Decision

As this controversy has not been determined and in view of the length of time which the grievances have been before the Committee, the Committee has decided to resolve the grievances in the following manner: The grievants will be upgraded for the period covered in R.C. Files Nos. 234 and 246. The denial of these grievances by the Division constitutes notice to the employees that in future cases they will not be upgraded unless they are assigned to work which is not contained or provided for in their respective job definitions. The correction sought for in the later two grievances is then denied.

FOR UNION:

R. W. Fields
W. M. Fleming
L. L. Mitchell

By

L. L. Mitchell

Date

Dec 18, 1962

FOR COMPANY:

E. F. Sibley
C. L. Yager
V. J. Thompson

By

[Signature]

Date

December 11, 1962