



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

475 L'Entant Plaza, SW
Washington, DC 20260

July 8, 1983

Mr. Kenneth D. Wilson
Assistant Director
Clerk Division
American Postal Workers Union,
AFL-CIO
817 - 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3399

ARTICLE	37
SECTION	3A8
SUBJECT	204-B
	APPLICATION

Re: Local
San Bernardino, CA 92403
H1C-5K-C 9959

Dear Mr. Wilson:

On April 25, 1983, we met with you to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

The matters presented by you as well as the applicable contractual provisions have been reviewed and given careful consideration.

The issue in this case is whether management was proper in accepting an application for an Express Mail Technician (PS-6) position from a clerk serving as an acting supervisor (204-B).

The facts in this case indicate that Clerk Frety was serving as a 204-B when she submitted an application for the position of Express Mail Technician, a best qualified position. Clerk Frety was ultimately awarded and assigned to the Express Mail Technician position.

The union contends that Clerk Frety was precluded from submitting the disputed application by the provisions of Article 37, Section 3(A)7. This section provides that "Clerks temporarily detailed to a supervisory position (204b) may not bid on vacant clerk craft duty assignments while so detailed."

[Handwritten signature]
David A. King
Labor Relations Department



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW
Washington, DC 20260

February 17, 1983

Mr. Kenneth D. Wilson
Assistant Director
Clerk Division
American Postal Workers
Union, AFL-CIO
817 - 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

ARTICLE	37
SECTION	3.A.7
SUBJECT	204B
	APPLICATION
	NO. ARB

37

Re: Class Action
Macon, GA 31201
HLC-3D-C 12458

Dear Mr. Wilson:

On January 27, 1983, we met to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

The matters presented by you as well as the applicable contractual provisions have been reviewed and given careful consideration.

The question in this grievance is whether management violated Article 37, Section 3.A.7, by not disqualifying an employee's application for a best qualified position due to the application being submitted while the employee was in a 204B status.

The contractual language only refers to senior qualified positions precluding employees in 204B assignments from exercising bids on vacant clerk craft duty assignments. As the language is silent regarding applying for positions, we feel management acted properly in awarding the position to the best qualified applicant.

Based on the foregoing conclusions, the grievance is denied.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Kahn
Daniel A. Kahn
Labor Relations Department