

TEAMSTERS UNITED PARCEL SERVICE  
NATIONAL GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

DOCKET

March 3 - 6, 2014

3:00 P.M.

THE WESTIN BEACH RESORT  
321 N. FT. LAUDERDALE BEACH BLVD.  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33304

**CASES CARRIED OVER:**

- N-07-176: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Keith Barros**, Union alleges the Company is violating **Articles 1 and 7**, by subcontracting freight.
- N-07-230: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected NorCal Locals**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 26 and 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting UPS Mail Innovations work.
- N-08-104: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming that the Company is subcontracting UPS Package work to SCS (RC 3-07-148).
- N-09-17: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22** by refusing to maintain Article 22 jobs created in the Local's jurisdiction.
- N-09-153: Local 542 v. UPS, San Diego, CA  
On behalf of **Larry Crothers**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting. Union requests that the Company return the work to UPS Feeder Drivers (4/18/08 and ongoing) **REDOCKETED**.
- N-09-218: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees within NorCal**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company is not replacing Article 22.3 jobs.
- N-09-223: Local 278 v. UPS, San Francisco, CA  
On behalf of **Encarnilo Mauricio**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3**, claiming that the Company is failing to post and bid permanently vacated full-time Article 22.3 positions.

- N-10-06: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN  
On behalf of **Becky Cole**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 6, Section 4**. The Company implemented EDS and IDS machines and cut 50% of the revenue recovery work force as a direct result, without notification or negotiation.
- N-10-199: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Rafael Russe**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 10**, claiming the Company has requested that the grievant pay \$30,525.00 to cover a lost package.
- N-10-205: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22.3 and all others that apply**, by neglecting to post for bid vacated 22.3 combination jobs, pursuant to the CBA.
- N-10-272: Local 964 v. UPS, Brook Park, OH  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 34, Section 1**. Part-time employees who don't reach the 750 hours of work do not receive any pro-rata pension as defined in Article 34, Section 1. The Union requests that the Company make contributions for all Part-Time employees who have worked at least 375 hours in any year, in accordance with the Contract.
- N-10-275: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1 and 32**, claiming the Company is utilizing non-bargaining unit employees to process post cards.
- N-10-282: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **Martin Klapac**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company improperly used employees of another Local Union's jurisdiction to perform work that should have been performed by Local 639 bargaining unit employees (11/29/09).

- N-10-283: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **Martin Klapac**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company improperly used members of another Local Union's jurisdiction to perform work that should have been performed by Local 639 bargaining unit members (12/6/09).
- N-11-09: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **William Cooper**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17, Section 1, Article 29, and all others that apply**, and requests that grievant be paid funeral leave and penalty pay.
- N-11-12: Local 355 v. UPS, Baltimore, MD  
On behalf of **Barry Freeburger, et al.**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22 and all others that apply**, and is requesting that all shifting work remain in the Feeder classification.
- N-11-33: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 1, 2 and 32**, claiming the Company has subcontracted work assigned to the collective bargaining unit in violation of the CBA, specifically the work of post card room clerks (Ongoing since 7/22/10).
- N-11-38: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 22, Section 5 and Article 6, Section 1**, by not offering part-time employees 3½ hours' work and not paying them their 3½ hour guarantee.
- N-11-81: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Wayne Scragg**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 36**. Center Manager Jeff Bossert has subjected grievant to discrimination by refusing to give him a low step truck. Bossert has given a reasonable accommodation to another driver however refuses to provide the same accommodation for grievant (Grievance #52906).

- N-11-161: Local 30 v. UPS, Jeanette, PA  
On behalf of **a Lorraine Zelmore (pilot) and Patty Myers**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4 and Article 36**. Female employees were removed and reassigned from their selected and awarded preferred jobs.
- N-11-166: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1 and 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting UPS/U.S. Post Office work (formerly N-173-07).
- N-11-176: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **Stan Seelert**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22 and all others that apply**, claiming Feeder Drivers worked out of classification (10/5/09).
- N-11-177: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 26 and 32**, claiming that the Company utilized subcontractors while qualified Feeder Drivers were sent back to their respective package centers (11/15/10).
- N-11-203: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 1, Section 2, Article 2, Section 1 and Article 32**. The Company has subcontracted work assigned to the bargaining unit in violation of the CBA; specifically, inside work - loading and unloading, and address correction.
- N-12-01: Local 577 v. UPS, Amarillo, TX  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is not replacing Article 22, Section 3 jobs.
- N-12-04: Local 516 v. UPS, Muskogee, OK  
On behalf of **Jessie Smith**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting Feeder loads that should be done by the bargaining unit (6/10/11 and ongoing).

- N-12-70: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **James Hoover, et al.**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3** claiming the Company has failed to post/bid/award vacated Article 22.3 jobs.
- N-12-71: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Laura Proano**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 36**, claiming grievant feels discriminated against for physical disability and age (8/24/11).
- N-12-72: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 26 and 32**, claiming that the Company is subcontracting bargaining unit work (11/28/11 - 12/24/11).
- N-12-645: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 32 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company is diverting work out of UPS to other UPS companies.
- N-12-651: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, NCSA Article 7 and NCSR Article 7**, claiming the Company is sabotaging the production on the Oakland night shift.
- N-12-652: Local 2785 v. UPS, San Francisco, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**, claiming the Company does not have a right to post all Preloaders' names with misloads for all Preloaders to see.
- N-12-656: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-050.
- N-12-657: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-051.

- N-12-658: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-052.
- N-12-659: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-053.
- N-12-660: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-055.
- N-12-661: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-056.
- N-12-662: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **M. Nelson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32, 43 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-10-11-089.
- N-12-663: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Thompson and Hasoskinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-048.
- N-12-664: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ  
On behalf of **Thompson and Hasoskinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-049.
- N-12-765: Local 623 v. UPS, Philadelphia, PA  
On behalf of **Harry Brown**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 29 and 17**, claiming the Company has failed to properly compensate grievant for Jury Duty (2/4/11).
- N-12-801: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected members**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**. Ongoing harassment with issues regarding schedule Grievance #67306 (ongoing)

- N-12-819: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steven Williams**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisors working (4/1/12).
- N-12-894: Local 856 v. UPS, San Bruno, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming Company is subcontracting bargaining unit work. Company is not abiding by the decision of Case No. N-11-87.
- N-12-895: Local 886 v. UPS, Oklahoma City, OK  
On behalf of **Terry Jones**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming Company is subcontracting bargaining unit work. Violation took place 2/10/12 and ongoing.
- N-12-1000: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Bret Corbett and April Frates**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 26, 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting/failure to provide information (RC 4/12/005 and RC 4/12/034) 12/12/11 and 12/30/11.
- N-12-1002: Local 174 v. UPS, Tukwila, WA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming Bargaining unit work is being subcontracted (August 31, 2011 and ongoing)
- N-12-671: Local 30 v. UPS, Jeannette, PA  
On behalf of **Barry Coffman**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 34 and all others that apply**, claiming pension payment not made for compensable time off (11/21 - 11/25/10) **REDOCKETED**.
- N-12-672: Local 30 v. UPS, Jeannette, PA  
On behalf of **Brad Bressler**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 34 and all others that apply**, claiming pension payment not contributed for compensable time off (Week ending June 25, 2011) **REDOCKETED**.



- N-12-1006: Local 355 v. UPS, Baltimore, MD  
On behalf of **Mike Petro, et al.**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3**, claiming the Company is refusing to fill a permanent vacancy.
- N-12-1008: Local 391 v. UPS, Raleigh, NC  
On behalf of **Thomas Sherron**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17 and all others that apply**. The Company failed to pay grievant five (5) hours of holiday pay for Christmas 2011. The Company owes him five (5) hours of holiday pay and penalty for each week they did not correct his paycheck.
- N-12-1038: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shevier Ramsumuj**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (ongoing violations from 7/12/12).
- N-12-1039: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Javier Pellet**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (ongoing violations from 7/5/12).
- N-12-1040: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Pawlikowski**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (ongoing violations from 6/4/12).
- N-12-1041: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vinny Perrone**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (ongoing violations from 5/11/12).
- N-12-1042: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Contini**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without

exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 5/23/12 and continuous).

- N-12-1043: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Domenick DeDomenico**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 5/14/12 and continuous).
- N-12-1044: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Black**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (5/11/12, 5/15/12, 7/10/12, 8/2/12, 8/6/12 and 9/12/12).
- N-12-1046: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alejandro Felix**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (7/10/12).
- N-12-1047: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Edween Villalta**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (5/31/12, 7/16/12, 7/17/12, 8/15/12 and 8/16/12).
- N-12-1049: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Alvarado**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (6/5/12, 6/27/12, 7/2/12, 7/9/12, 7/17/12 and 8/27/12).
- N-12-1050: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Beutura**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without

exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (7/10/12).

- N-12-1051: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vic Aghabekian**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (7/6/12, 7/9/12, 7/13/12 and 8/29/12).
- N-12-1052: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael Aspinall**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (7/2/12, 7/13/12, 7/31/12, 8/1/12 and 8/17/12).
- N-12-1053: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Beutura**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (7/10/12).
- N-12-1055: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Javier Pellot**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 6 and all others that apply**. Manager John Woods denied the employee their contractual eight (8) hour guarantee and had them enter into an extra contract agreement to go home at time only instead of working (8/11/12).
- N-12-1061: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 7**. Employees have not been allowed to remain on the job, without loss of pay unless and until the discharge or suspension is sustained under the grievance procedure (ongoing from 6/28/12).
- N-12-1062: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shevier Ramsamuj**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. Manager John Woods failed to correct the employee's pay shortage which was a result of an Employer error.

- N-12-1065: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Victor Hernandez**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has delivered bargaining unit work without exhausting all means to use bargaining unit employees (7/2/12 and ongoing).
- N-12-1071: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Todd Titolo**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing violations from 5/14/12).
- N-12-1074: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Hector Chang**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (5/9/12).
- N-12-1080: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jeff Delbrune**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming Supervision failed to correct grievant's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 7/7/12).
- N-12-1085: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Sherwin Brown**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, claiming Supervisor Larry Cirullo failed to correct grievant's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 7/12/12).
- N-12-1095: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Julian**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing violations from 5/29/12).

- N-12-1268: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daunell Augustine**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. Manager John Woods failed to correct the employee's pay shortage which was a result of an Employer error (ongoing from 7/18/12)
- N-13-13: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN  
On behalf **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 32, and all others that apply**. The Company is using subcontractors to perform bargaining unit work, in violation of the CBA and longstanding past practice at the Knoxville, TN facility (8/11/11 and ongoing to present date).
- N-13-30: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside NJ  
On behalf of **Eugene Haskins**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**, claiming rogue manager, Joe Rooth, made disparaging remarks (Grievance #71802).
- N-13-31: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting the movement of feeder equipment (Grievance Numbers 68943 and 66302).
- N-13-43: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3**, claiming the Company has failed to fill vacancies as required by the CBA.
- N-13-124: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William Groll and Phil Martorana**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors doing bargaining unit work, 8/27/12 and 8/28/12.
- N-13-125: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors performed bargaining unit work, 7/24/12.

- N-13-126: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors performed bargaining unit work, 7/20/12.
- N-13-127: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors performed bargaining unit work, 7/17/12 and 7/18/12.
- N-13-128: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors performed bargaining unit work, 6/29/12.
- N-13-129: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors were observed performing bargaining unit work, 6/3/12.
- N-13-130: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana, Bill Groll and E. St. Jean**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors were observed performing bargaining unit work, 5/10/12.
- N-13-131: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors were observed performing bargaining unit work, 5/3/12.
- N-13-132: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors were observed performing bargaining unit work, 5/1/12.
- N-13-133: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana, Bill Groll and E. St. Jean**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Company Supervisors were observed performing bargaining unit work, 4/27/12.

- N-13-224: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Brad Hedden**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17**, claiming the Company is not paying Article 17 violation that the grievant is owed 9/13/12.
- N-13-225: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Richard Williams**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is doing bargaining unit work 11/29/12.
- N-13-226: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hiram Castro**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Company has management personnel doing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.
- N-13-227: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis J. Valderrama**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Company has management personnel doing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.
- N-13-228: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis J. Valderrama**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Company has management personnel doing bargaining unit work 12/19/12.
- N-13-229: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis J. Valderrama**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Company has management personnel doing bargaining unit work 12/20/12.
- N-13-230: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis J. Valderrama**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Company has management personnel doing bargaining unit work 12/22/12.
- N-13-231: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis J. Valderrama**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Company has management personnel doing bargaining unit work 12/24/12.

- N-13-232: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.
- N-13-233: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/26/12.
- N-13-234: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/21/12.
- N-13-235: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 1/8/13.
- N-13-236: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 1/17/13.
- N-13-237: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 2/14/13.
- N-13-238: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 2/15/13.
- N-13-239: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 11/28/12 and 11/29/12.



- N-13-240: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hiram Ramos**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/24/12, 12/26/12, 1/2/13 and 1/8/13.
- N-13-241: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Jorge Carrasquillo**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/26/12, 1/3/13 and 1/8/13.
- N-13-242: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 1/2/13.
- N-13-243: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Efrain Vera**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12 and 12/26/12.
- N-13-244: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Ricardo Giraldo**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12 and 12/26/12.
- N-13-245: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis J. Valderrama**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming an Administrative employee is performing bargaining unit work 12/26/12.
- N-13-246: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Luis O. Rivera**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming an Administrative employee is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.
- N-13-247: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Jimmy Reyes**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.

- N-13-248: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Rafael Martinez**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.
- N-13-249: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Orlando De Jesus**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4&7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work 12/17/12.
- N-13-250: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Thurman Ward**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 36 & 37**, claiming the Supervisor is in violation of Articles 36 & 37 (2/12/13).
- N-13-251: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Charles Marchese**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor took packages from the driver and shuttled to another driver (1/25/13).
- N-13-252: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Charles Marchese**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor brought packages out to the driver (3/22/13).
- N-13-253: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Charles Marchese**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor is shuttling packages out to the driver (7/9/13).
- N-13-254: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Schneider**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor shuttled and delivered packages from the driver (7/18/13).
- N-13-255: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Craig Britten**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor was taking work off of the

driver and shuttling packages to other drivers (1/16/13).

- N-13-256: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Jim Larose**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor is working on Mondays (7/8/13).
- N-13-257: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Miazga**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor took packages off of the driver and delivered them along with an air driver (7/12/13).
- N-13-261: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **Dave Hamilton**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22 and all others that apply**, claiming he should have received his part-time raise on 2/1/2012 prior to working his first day as a full-timer on 2/15/2012 (2/1/12).
- N-13-262: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Adallas Lucas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 1/15/13 up to and including 5/23/13).
- N-13-263: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Abdallas Lucas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing).
- N-13-264: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Urena**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company management team failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from week ending 1/29/13).

- N-13-265: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Urena**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/11/13 and 3/12/13).
- N-13-266: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Brandon Sanfilippo**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-267: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Bryan Jimenez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-268: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Carlos Combe**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing).
- N-13-269: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Rosario**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/24/13).
- N-13-270: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Shaw**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring

from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).

- N-13-271: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daniel Perez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (1/16/13).
- N-13-272: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daquan Williams**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-273: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Darrell Tucker**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-274: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jonathan Vargas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor treated Alternate Shop Steward without dignity and respect and sent him home when addressing a grievance (ongoing but escalated on 1/14/13).
- N-13-275: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Darrell Tucker**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 1/16/13 up to and including 5/23/13).

- N-13-276: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **David Bardouille**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-277: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **David Cardona**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Supervisor Alex Brevario failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from week ending 3/11/12).
- N-13-278: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Davon Lewis**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-279: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Diao Mbaye**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-280: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Duran Nettles**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-281: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Eric Zaman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).

- N-13-282: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Eric Zaman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 4/10/13 up to and including 5/16/13).
- N-13-283: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Scarpinito**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-284: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Fred Louisjean**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-285: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frederico Ramirez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**. The Company failed to pay grievant for time worked (3/27/13).
- N-13-286: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **George Pachas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-287: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Hector Chang**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing).

- N-13-288: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jean Coismain**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-289: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jedidiah Glass**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-290: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jedidiah Glass**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisor Alex Brevario has overly supervised the aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties (ongoing but escalated on 1/11/13).
- N-13-291: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jedidiah Glass**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/24/13).
- N-13-292: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jeffry Francois**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-293: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joe Santorio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**. The manager Mike Hickey has overly supervised and harassed the aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties (ongoing but escalated on 3/5/13).



- N-13-294: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Becker**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**. The Supervisors Alex Brevario, Silvia Medina, and Wille Flores have overly supervised the aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties (ongoing but escalated on 6/6/13).
- N-13-295: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Becker**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**. The Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 2/12/13 up to and including 7/24/13).
- N-13-296: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jose Garcia**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-297: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joseph Orsaris**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-298: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Julian Smith**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-299: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kadeem Bishop**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring

from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).

- N-13-300: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Julian Smith**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (1/7/13 up to and including 6/7/13).
- N-13-301: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kamal Kaalund**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-302: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kamal Kaalund**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 4**, claiming the Company has not given the Steward designated by the Local Union, documents/information that is reasonably related (based on NLRA standards) to pending grievances (ongoing).
- N-13-303: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kamal Kaalund**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Center Manager Santiago Lado repeatedly treats the Shop Steward without dignity and respect and refuses to deal with him (ongoing but escalated on 3/8/13).
- N-13-304: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kamal Kaalund**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/22/13 up to and including 7/24/13).

- N-13-305: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kareem Carruth**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisors Ashia Ahmad and Alex Brevario have overly supervised the aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties (ongoing but escalated on 1/17/13).
- N-13-306: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kazembe Manning**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-307: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kioma Forrero**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-308: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kioma Forrero**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisors Felix Francisco and Alex Brevario have overly supervised the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties (ongoing but escalated on 12/27/12).
- N-13-309: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kioma Forrero**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 1/11/13 up to and including 7/31/13).
- N-13-310: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Latasha Hines**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Supervisor Alex Brevario failed to correct the

Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from week ending 3/30/13).

- N-13-311: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Manuel Lim**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisor Robert Hall has overly supervised the aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties (ongoing but escalated 3/8/13).
- N-13-312: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Manuel Lim**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-313: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Simpson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-314: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mathew Rodrigez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-315: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael Allen**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-316: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mitchel Robi**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring

from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).

- N-13-317: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Oneil McDowell**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-318: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Paul Giacomico**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-319: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Porffy Gonzalez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-320: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Presuella F. Nelson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-321: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Rahlou Smith**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-322: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Rahlou Smith**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without

exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 6/10/13 up to and including 6/13/13).

- N-13-323: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Raymond Benn**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing).
- N-13-324: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Ford**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-325: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Tavera**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-326: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Roberto H. Panchame**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-327: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robin Cresso**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).

- N-13-328: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Roman Silverman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-329: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Roberto Panchame**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (1/3/13).
- N-13-330: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Roman Silverman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 4 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company refused to give the designated alternate reasonable time to investigate, present and process grievances on the Company's property. There was no interruption of the Employers business or operation by the alternate steward (ongoing).
- N-13-331: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Roman Silverman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/8/13 up to and including 3/19/13).
- N-13-332: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Sherman Wong and all others**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees with 6 months or more seniority to be moved to a preferred job within their building (ongoing from 4/10/13 up to and including 5/16/13).

- N-13-333: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Sherwin Brown**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing).
- N-13-334: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tamara Riche**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-335: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tamara Riche**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company failed to pay grievant for time worked (4/9/13 and 5/24/13).
- N-13-336: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tariq Hobbs**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-337: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tariq Hobbs**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/12/13).
- N-13-338: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Todd Titolo/Joe Bagnasco**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 1 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has subcontracted work assigned to the collective bargaining unit in violation of the C.B.A.



specifically the work of removing skids. (ongoing since 4/29/13 up to and including 5/10/13).

- N-13-339: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Turhan Medina**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing).
- N-13-340: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kazembe Manning**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 22, Section 4**, claiming the Company has not given part-time employees the opportunity to fill full-time jobs before hiring from the outside on a six-for-one basis (six (6) part-time to every (1) one outside hire (ongoing)).
- N-13-341: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alexander Richardson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/8/11).
- N-13-342: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Edwards**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Rechner failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 3/7/13).
- N-13-343: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Courtney Zincko Howard**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Tyrell Samuel failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 7/24/13).
- N-13-344: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **David Darrisaw**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Manager Joe Schmidt has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without

dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 1/30/13).

- N-13-345: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **David Darrisaw**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 1/10/13 up to and including 9/4/13).
- N-13-346: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Weiming Cen**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 6/6/13 up to and including 6/27/13).
- N-13-347: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William Groll**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/13/11 up to and including 8/16/13).
- N-13-348: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William J. Lay**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/25/13 up to and including 8/6/13).
- N-13-349: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Thomas Brooks**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 1/13/10 up to and including 9/4/13).

- N-13-350: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Victor Hernandez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/25/13 up to and including 6/27/13).
- N-13-351: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana/Keston Dick**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (8/28/12 up to and including 8/9/13).
- N-13-352: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana/Bill Groll**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/24/11 up to and including 9/11/13).
- N-13-353: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Natasha Creightney**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 7/8/13 up to and including 8/22/13).
- N-13-354: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kien Spicer**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/29/13).

- N-13-355: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Keston B. Dick**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 5/17/13 up to and including 7/30/13).
- N-13-356: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jairo Vasquez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/17/13 and 6/18/13).
- N-13-357: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jose A. Muniz**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (2/14/13 up to and including 6/6/13).
- N-13-358: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Edward Oguchi**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees. This was during a reduction in staff (1/25/11 up to and including 2/2/11).
- N-13-359: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees. The Supervisor used a scanner under varied employee's names while employees were not

present (ongoing from 8/2/10 up to and including 9/6/13).

- N-13-360: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Pedro Espinal**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees. The Supervisor used a scanner under varied employee's names while employees were not present (ongoing from 5/17/13 up to and including 7/30/13).
- N-13-361: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana and Bill Groll**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 4**, claiming the Company has not given the Stewards designated by the Local Union, documents/information that is reasonably related (based on NLRA standards) to pending grievances (ongoing).
- N-13-362: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dennis Cadell**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Rechner failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 10/14/11).
- N-13-363: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Diana Torres**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming Management failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 2/27/13).
- N-13-364: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Doris Barrett**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company unreasonably denied the employee long term disability that she was eligible for under SPD. (ongoing from 5/1/13).

- N-13-365: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Doris Barrett**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Rechner failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 10/6/11).
- N-13-366: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kevin Johnson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming Management failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 12/17/12).
- N-13-367: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Leclerc Wesifort**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming Management failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 1/7/11).
- N-13-368: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Courtney Paul Hummell**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Rechner failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 10/14/11).
- N-13-369: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Martorana**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Rechner failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 10/14/11).
- N-13-370: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tameeka Roberts**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming Management failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 8/15/13).
- N-13-371: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jodi Kipping**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every

reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing 2012 through 2013).

- N-13-372: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joe Morabito**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/31/12 and 8/8/12).
- N-13-373: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Campanella**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32**, claiming the Company used outside contractors to do Local 804 porters work (6/25/13).
- N-13-374: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Phil Robert Monahan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company had part time workers doing clerk work (9/10/12).
- N-13-379: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Pete Richards**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (5/24/12 through 3/4/13).
- N-13-381: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Todd Henris**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32** (2/11/13).
- N-13-382: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Baietto**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32** (2/11/13).
- N-13-383: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Brian Madden**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32** Subcontracting issue (2/11/13).

- N-13-387: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jamie Holligan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (8/21/13).
- N-13-388: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Barry Duane**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (2/7/12 and 2/9/12).
- N-13-389: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kimani Desire**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/28/13).
- N-13-390: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Maurice Cooper**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/18/12 through 6/22/12).
- N-13-391: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **James Crump**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (1/2/13 and 1/14/13).



- N-13-392: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Garth Cedano**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/24/12).
- N-13-393: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Basil Darling**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/18/13).
- N-13-394: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kaslyw Belgrave**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (12/13/12).
- N-13-395: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alberto Arias**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/2, 7/5, 7/31 & 8/1 in 2013).
- N-13-396: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Lincoln McKenzie**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/19/12).

- N-13-397: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael Maisano**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/12/12 and 7/19/12).
- N-13-398: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Alvarado**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (8/13/13).
- N-13-399: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daniel Casilla**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 3/14/13 up to and including 9/6/13).
- N-13-400: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joseph Luzuriaga**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 8/2/13 up to and including 8/9/13).
- N-13-401: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael Black**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 9/4/13 up to and including 9/6/13).

- N-13-402: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Pawlikowski**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 10/8/12 up to and including 9/11/13).
- N-13-403: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Thomas Oliver**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 2/27/13 up to and including 9/9/13).
- N-13-404: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Victor Aghabekian**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/18/13).
- N-13-405: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vincent Perrone**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 10/8/12 up to and including 9/11/13).
- N-13-406: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Eddie Villalta**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 2/5/13 up to and including 8/21/13).

- N-13-407: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gilberto Santana**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisor Keith Simmons has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 5/14/13).
- N-13-408: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gustavo Escobar**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisors Fred Kaufman and Akiles Mendez has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 7/10/13).
- N-13-409: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ivan Yadicella**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Supervisor Keith Simmons has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 5/31/13).
- N-13-410: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Contini**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 2/8/13 up to and including 7/8/13).
- N-13-411: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kenneth Lapanne**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Manager Rob Charles has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 7/10/13).
- N-13-412: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Luis Monzon**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with

bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 4/1/13 up to and including 7/11/13).

- N-13-413: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Grant**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Kevin Colwell failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 5/2/13).
- N-13-414: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Gillard**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (6/5/13).
- N-13-415: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shawn Williams**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 7/15/13 up to and including 8/20/13).
- N-13-416: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Ambrosio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/10/13-ongoing).
- N-13-417: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Eddie Aldridge**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/24/13-ongoing).
- N-13-418: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dan Betancourt**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (5/29/13-ongoing).

- N-13-419: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vincent Chierchie**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/3/13-ongoing).
- N-13-420: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Louis Cintron**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (8/22/13-ongoing).
- N-13-421: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Coleman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/25/13-ongoing).
- N-13-422: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Pat Finnerty**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/2/13-ongoing).
- N-13-423: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Focazio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (5/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-424: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Bill Keller**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (5/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-425: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joe Martino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/26/13-ongoing).
- N-13-426: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Neary**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/1/13-ongoing).

- N-13-427: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Noethiger**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/27/13-ongoing).
- N-13-428: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Reynolds**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/22/13-ongoing).
- N-13-429: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Robinson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-430: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jose Suarez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (8/12/13-ongoing).
- N-13-431: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Johns**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/21/13, 3/27/13, 4/10/13 and 4/18/13).
- N-13-432: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Bob Ring**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (1/5/13).
- N-13-433: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Somdat Ramkishun**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient

workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (8/16/12 and 8/22/12).

- N-13-434: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Andre Prime**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (8/21/12, 6/24/13, 6/26/13, 7/1/13, 7/2/13 and 7/5/13).
- N-13-435: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daniel Pharel**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (8/5/13).
- N-13-436: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Bankole Thomas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/18/12 and 3/18/13).
- N-13-437: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Danny Torres**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/2/12, 7/3/12, 7/18/12, 7/19/12 and 7/27/12).
- N-13-438: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Thanddues Palmer**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining



unit employees (4/18/12, 4/22/12, 4/23/12, 7/13/12, 7/17/12, 7/27/12, 8/1/12, 8/2/12, 8/21/12, 5/8/13, 5/12/13, and 6/3/13).

- N-13-439: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joseph Sclafani**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/18/12 and 7/25/12).
- N-13-440: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Danny Villagran**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 7**, claiming the employee had returned to regular duties after sustaining a compensable injury, and was required by the Worker's Compensation doctor to receive additional medical treatment during the employee's regularly scheduled working hours. Manager Santiago Lado refused to work the employee to avoid paying the employee's regular hourly rate of pay for such time. (3/4/13)
- N-13-441: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vincente Carlo**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Hickey failed to correct the Employee's pay after a grievance settlement (ongoing from 5/2/13).
- N-13-442: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tim Hargrove**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Manager John Woods has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 8/29/13).
- N-13-443: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 5/9/13 up to and including 6/10/13).

- N-13-444: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Miguel Sterling**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 5/10/13 up to and including 5/20/13).
- N-13-445: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael Diaz**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing from 5/13/13 up to and including 5/17/13).
- N-13-446: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Maynor Gomez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (3/29/13).
- N-13-447: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Abdeel Mora**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming several managers failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 10/6/11).
- N-13-448: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Rene Duchatellier and all affected members**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming the Employer continually fails to allow a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the package car drivers worked in any Center off on a daily basis for the relief of overtime in violation of Article 37 (ongoing from 6/20/13).
- N-13-449: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Neal Teney**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming the Employer continually fails to allow a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the package car drivers worked in any

Center off on a daily basis for the relief of overtime in violation of Article 37 (ongoing from 4/8/13)

- N-13-450: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Harvey Dupuy**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Manager Steve Weiderhold has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 7/2/13)
- N-13-451: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Figueroa**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming the Employer continually fails to allow a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the package car drivers worked in any Center off on a daily basis for the relief of overtime in violation of Article 37 (ongoing from 4/19/13)
- N-13-452: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Keston Roberts**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (7/18/12, 7/19/12 and 7/23/12).
- N-13-453: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Scott Damone, Peter DePierro and Dan Marangiello**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (6/27/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-454: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Larry Marino**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (6/27/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-455: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gary Bolk and John Koeppe**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (6/27/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-456: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark English**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Grievant worked as a cover clerk on 5/1/13; his timecard was put in as an Optional Holiday. He still has not received his 8 hours' pay or an Optional Holiday restored (5/1/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-457: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Young**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (4/4/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-458: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ken Buglione**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (8/5/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-459: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William Conforti**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/15/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-460: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Fischetti**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (6/3/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-461: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Amy Goldstein-Melendez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (6/26/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-462: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Hyland**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (5/20/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-463: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Greg Misa**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (5/20/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-464: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Lew Panico**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (8/23/13).
- N-13-465: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Ryan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (5/20/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-466: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Scott Damone**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (4/9/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-467: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Peter DePierro**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (3/12/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-468: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Koeppe**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (6/18/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-469: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Larry Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/9/13).

- N-13-470: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Larry Loverde**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/8, 7/9, 7/10 and 7/11/13).
- N-13-471: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gary Bolk**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/11/13).
- N-13-472: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Paul Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/16/13).
- N-13-473: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Adel Elsalam**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/16/13).
- N-13-474: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Kelly**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/22/13).
- N-13-475: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY  
On behalf of **William Pearson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 7**. Grievant was discharged for violating the Company's professional conduct and anti-harassment policy, a non-cardinal violation, and not allowed to remain on the job (7/5/13).
- N-13-478: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY  
On behalf of **David Notaro**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**, claiming Manager Joe Borello verbally abused and belittled grievant. Workers shall be treated with dignity and respect at all times (4/25/13).
- N-13-479: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY  
On behalf of **Ronald Stoddard**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**, claiming Manager Joe Borello verbally abused and belittled grievant.

Workers shall be treated with dignity and respect at all times (4/25/13).

- N-13-480: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY  
On behalf of **Jason Grosjean**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 4**. The Company continues to violate the Part-time employees preferred job language and has not honored grievant's request regarding his preferred job, ongoing for a 2-year period (2012-2013).
- N-13-481: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Celeste**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 4**. The Company continues to violate the Part-time employees preferred job language and has not honored grievant's request regarding his preferred job, ongoing for a 2-year period (2012-2013).
- N-13-482: Local 769 v. UPS, Miami, FL  
On behalf of **Thomas Burris**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17**, claiming the Company has not paid the employee for all time in service 9/21/12, 9/24-26/12.
- N-13-486: Local 79 v. UPS, Tampa, FL  
On behalf of **Tisha Richardson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17**. The Company is paying employees option days in advance of employees actually taking the days off, in violation of clear Supplemental language, and then taxing them at a higher rate of 25% (1/3/13).
- N-13-220: Local 986 v. UPS, Santa Maria, CA  
On behalf of **Art Silvas and Scot Kufferath**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3, Section 4**, claiming the Company assigned feeder work to a package car driver(s) 1/21/13.
- N-13-222: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **Sergio DeLaLuz**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 1 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company utilized subcontractors while qualified feeder drivers were sent back to their respective package centers (11/13/12).

- N-13-223: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 41**, claiming the Company reconfigured existing 22.3 combination jobs from inside/outside to inside/inside creating a shortage of pay for affected employee's (October/November 2012).
- N-13-585: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Robert Duncan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (1/3/13).
- N-13-586: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Robert Duncan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (5/21/13 and 5/30/13).
- N-13-587: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Bret Corbett**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (6/8/11).
- N-13-588: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Jerry McCoy**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (11/21/12).



SOUTH

- N-14-01: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX  
On behalf of **Craig Curtis**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company brought in an outside contractor and had them start performing automotive bargaining unit work on trailers that up until August of 2013 had always been performed by the bargaining unit (8/19/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-02: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX  
On behalf of **Edward Miller**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company brought in an outside contractor and had them start performing automotive bargaining unit work on trailers that up until August of 2013 had always been performed by the bargaining unit (8/27/2013).
- N-14-03: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX  
On behalf of **Edward Miller**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company brought in an outside contractor and had them start performing automotive bargaining unit work on trailers that up until August of 2013 had always been performed by the bargaining unit (ongoing since 8/19/2013).
- N-14-04: Local 728 v. UPS, Atlanta, GA  
On behalf of **Regina Baggs**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 26 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company used subcontractors to return empty trailers to rental lots (4/11/2013).

**EAST**

- N-14-05: Local 30 v. UPS, Jeanette, PA  
On behalf of **Dean Korber**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant was harassed and intimidated on numerous occasions (March 28, 2013 and prior).
- N-14-06: Local 30 v. UPS, Jeanette, PA  
On behalf of **Ted Miller**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work without exhausting all means, and also sent people home early throughout the shift (12/18/2011).
- N-14-07: Local 326 v. UPS, New Castle, DE  
On behalf of **Doug Hite**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company used non bargaining unit personnel including supervisors to perform bargaining unit package car work exhausting all qualified employees in October in order to prevent employees from gaining seniority (Month of October).
- N-14-08: Local 118 v. UPS, Rochester, NY  
On behalf of **Paula La Rocca**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 22, Section 5**. The Union claims the Company did not pay the \$1.00 per hour sort rate for vacations (1/9/1997 to current).
- N-14-09: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Rayzon Jackson**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 10**. The Union claims the grievant should not be liable for reimbursement or discipline and for lost or stolen packages until grievant procedure is heard (11/27/2013).

- N-14-10: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Harold Johnson**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims supervisors are performing bargaining unit work (5/29/2013).
- N-14-11: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Harold Johnson**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims supervisors are performing bargaining unit work (5/31/2013).
- N-14-12: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Brian Taylor**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims continued harassment by Center Manager Joe Rooth (9/6/2013).
- N-14-13: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Nick Sadlowski**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims continued harassment by Center Manager Joe Rooth (9/6/2013).
- N-14-14: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Vinnie Cantarelli**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 21**. The Union claims the grievant was singled out and discriminated against because he is a Shop Steward (1/16/2012 ongoing to 5/18/2012).
- N-14-15: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32**. The Union claims the Company is using subcontractors to bid more center work (12/16/2012).
- N-14-16: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32**. The Union claims the Company is using subcontractors to bid more center work (11/25/2012).

- N-14-17: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32**. The Union claims the Company is using subcontractors to bid more center work (12/9/2012).
- N-14-18: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32**. The Union claims the Company is using subcontractors to bid more center work (12/2/2012).
- N-14-19: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Ambrosio**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-20: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Todd Henris**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/30/2013).
- N-14-21: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William J. Keller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-22: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert West**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/30/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-23: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Dulaney**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-24: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Focazio**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/26/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-25: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dan Betancourt**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (1/6/2014 and ongoing).
- N-14-26: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William Hill, Vincent Palifka and Matt Beattie**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 14, Section 1**. The Union claims the Employer called Mr. Hill and Mr. Palifka to the Division Manager office and placed on a one day suspension. Mr. Beattie was issued a warning letter for an injury he sustained (10/1/2013).
- N-14-27: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Scott Damone and Peter DePierro**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union claims the Employer has not paid grievances timely within 10 working days of settlement agreement and penalty pay is now owed (7/8/2013 to present).
- N-14-28: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Craig Newman**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisor Ken English, Manager Frank Maffei and Division Manager Pat Sheppard, harassed and overly supervising Craig Newman (1/14/2014).
- N-14-29: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michelle Smith**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (10/21/2013).

- N-14-30: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Young**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/5/2013).
- N-14-31: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Craig Newman**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (10/2/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-32: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Ruffillo**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (10/4/2013).
- N-14-33: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Aron Hershkowitz**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/26/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-34: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Larry Loverde**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013).
- N-14-35: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Peter DePierro**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/17/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-36: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Scott Damone**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/16/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-37: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kendal Laird**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/30/2013).
- N-14-38: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gary Bolk**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/31/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-39: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **Mary D. Shaw**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 32**. The Union claims improper use of subcontractors (4/10/2013).
- N-14-40: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **Mary D. Shaw**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims improper use of out of center driver(s) (4/3/2013).
- N-14-41: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC  
On behalf of **Michael Iannone**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 22**. The Union claims failure of Company to fill Article 22.3 vacancy (current and ongoing).
- N-14-42: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Gonzales**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (12/12/2013 and 12/17/2013).
- N-14-43: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kevin Patterson**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (12/18/2013, 12/23/2013, 12/24/2013 and 12/26/2013).

- N-14-44: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alex Monaco**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (10/9/2013, 12/16/2013, 12/19/2013, 12/20/2013, 12/23/2013 and 12/24/2013).
- N-14-45: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Pierre Patrick**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (12/17/2013).
- N-14-46: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Wilson**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (1/6/2014 through 1/15/2014).
- N-14-47: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joseph Caravello**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union claims the Company failed to pay agreed to settlement within ten days (11/28/2013).
- N-14-48: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Carlin**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (9/10/2013).
- N-14-49: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Brian Madden, John Baietto and Todd Henris**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Subcontracting (2/11/2013).
- N-14-50: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Brian Madden**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors working during free period (12/1/2013 through 12/24/2013).



- N-14-51: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Company used free period hires and expeditors past contractual date (1/1/2014-ongoing).
- N-14-52: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gustavo Lorian**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims harassment (11/7/2013).
- N-14-53: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ralston Bozwell, Jason Jessup, Mike Costanza and Josh Morgan**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims harassment (11/19/2013, 11/20/2013, and prior grievances submitted to the Company from 9/2013-1/31/2014).
- N-14-54: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Trevor King, Guy Exnior, Luis Sepulveda and William Duggan**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union claims grievances were settled with Labor Manager Warren Pandascia 5/17/2013 and agreed to be paid (5/17/2013).
- N-14-55: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Keenan Boston**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is doing bargaining unit work (Grievance #71184).
- N-14-56: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **John Savoie**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union claims there is an ongoing pay shortage.
- N-14-57: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Walter Barbosa**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union claims there is an ongoing pay shortage.

- N-14-58: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68727).
- N-14-59: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68748).
- N-14-60: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #69132).
- N-14-61: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #69134).
- N-14-62: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72383).
- N-14-63: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73053).
- N-14-64: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73075).
- N-14-65: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The

Union claims Supervisor T. Musto is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73076).

- N-14-66: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73077).
- N-14-67: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #70424).
- N-14-68: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73051).
- N-14-69: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73052).
- N-14-70: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73054).
- N-14-71: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72380).
- N-14-72: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72379).

- N-14-73: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72381).
- N-14-74: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72382).
- N-14-75: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68721).
- N-14-76: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #69133).
- N-14-77: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #71183).
- N-14-78: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #74586).
- N-14-79: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #74330).
- N-14-80: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The

Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #74428).

- N-14-81: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68722).
- N-14-82: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72061).
- N-14-83: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72367).
- N-14-84: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72368).
- N-14-85: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #71182).
- N-14-86: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68724).
- N-14-87: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68721).

N-14-88: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work.

**WEST**

- N-14-89: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **Trey Wilton**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 36 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company is violating contractual rights by unfairly disqualifying grievant as a driver (7/3/2013).
- N-14-90: Local 174 v. UPS, Tukwila, WA  
On behalf of **Matt Svarz**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims the Company is allowing full time Supervisor Rick Aholelei to perform bargaining unit work during the months of November and December 2012 (Peak season 2012).
- N-14-91: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Union claims the Company is refusing to provide Local 70 information (7/5/2013).

**SAFETY AND HEALTH COMMITTEE**

**CASES CARRIED OVER:**

- N-10-124: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Articles 18, 47 and all others that apply**, with respect to health, safety and climate conditions as a result of the thermostat set points at 45 degrees Fahrenheit for occupied and 40 degrees Fahrenheit for unoccupied areas.
- N-10-129: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18, Section 6 and all others that apply**, claiming a change of practice by the Company to lower building temperature from 54 degrees Fahrenheit to 40 degrees Fahrenheit.
- N-11-90: Local 651 v. UPS, Lexington, KY  
On behalf of **Blake Jenkins, William Scott Clary and Richard Haun**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18, Section 6**, claiming conditions are too cold, requesting that the heat be turned on or up.
- N-11-91: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **William Rivera**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 35, Sections 4 and 10**. Grievant was terminated after failing a drug test. He went to rehab, was reinstated to his position and then failed an alcohol test by .5.
- N-11-97: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**, claiming the Company created an unsafe work area in Edison Small Sort.
- N-11-118: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Wayne Scragg**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 14**. Grievant reported for work, refused work by Center Manager Jeff Bossert. Bossert stated "he is not going to



make reasonable accommodations to him by giving him a low step truck." (Grievance #52904)

- N-11-124: Local 344 v. UPS, Milwaukee, WI  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 18**, that claiming low backed seats in tractors are serious safety concern and a violation of the Safety and Health Preamble.
- N-11-288: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Laura Proano**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 14**, claiming that the Company is not acting in a timely manner to provide grievant an accommodation.
- N-12-690: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN  
On behalf of **Paul Murray**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 18, 6 and all others that apply**, claiming building heat (December 2009).
- N-12-691: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN  
On behalf of **Steve Odom**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 18, 6 and all others that apply**, claiming building heat (ongoing).
- N-12-692: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN  
On behalf of **Tracy Wallace**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 18, 6 and all others that apply**, claiming building heat (ongoing).
- N-12-900: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Jose Colon**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 35**, the urine sample given by employee was not enough but was not a Refusal and seeks job back with back pay (4/13/12).
- N-12-998: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Keith Thomas**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**. Company has a new policy to remove package car driver after having accidents from routes for not knowing D.O.K questions (week ending 3/22/12).

- N-12-1108: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Jose Rivera**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 14, Section 3**, claiming the Company didn't provide grievant a reasonable accommodation (7/27/12).
- N-11-289: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**. The Company is causing an unsafe work environment by asking and allowing part-time employees to push empty air cans into trailers where there are no rollers on the trailer floor (3/29/11) **REDOCKETED**.
- N-13-144: Local 391 v. UPS, Raleigh, NC  
On behalf of **Phillip Williams**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 16 and 20**. After grievant was released by a doctor to return to work, the Company failed to provide work for him (9/10 - 10/11/12 [468-12]).
- N-13-150: Local 992 v. UPS, Hagerstown, MD  
On behalf of **Gary Stanfield**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 16, Section 3.3**. After properly notifying the Company of his DUI citation that occurred on 11/3/12, the Company did not allow grievant to work inside pending completion of the SAP assessment and return to work call (11/9-16/12).
- N-13-151: Local 992 v. UPS, Hagerstown, MD  
On behalf of **Gary Stanfield**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 16, Section 3.3**. After properly notifying the Company of his DUI citation that occurred on 11/3/12, the Company did not allow grievant to work inside pending completion of the SAP assessment and return to work call (11/19/12).
- N-13-152: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Karren Montemarano**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 14, Section 1, and Article 37**. Grievant was not allowed to work January 31, March 11, March 29 and May 2, 2013 after seeing her doctor for treatment for a work related injury.

- N-13-156: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside NJ  
On behalf of **Eugene Haskins**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 18**, claiming Manager Joe Rooth disregarded the health and well-being of an injured employee (Grievance #71801).
- N-13-218: Local 63 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **Cheryl Brown**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 14**. Company delayed a reasonable accommodation. Grievant seeking back pay. (May 5, 2011 through March 2012).
- N-13-488: Local 294 v. UPS, Albany, NY  
On behalf of **Andrew Corridore**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 16 and all others that apply**. The grievant bid a non-driving Article 22.3 for part of the year for loss of license. Under the CBA, time on this job should not count towards the year of loss of license (8/22/13).
- N-13-490: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Harvey Dupuy**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 18**, claiming the Company has refused to meet to re-establish the CHSP (safety) committees escalating the safety violations, specifically egress through package cars (ongoing but escalated on 7/2/13).
- N-13-491: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a Company violated **Article 16 and all others that apply**, by arbitrarily deviating from the written SAP recommendations for an employee.
- N-13-492: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. Union Steward John Woodrich has filed multiple grievances regarding safety violations - boxes falling, high from the P-D's, and the stacking of irregulars blocking egress and ingress (3/25/13 - 3/29/13).
- N-13-584: Local 222 v. UPS, Salt Lake City, UT  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 14**, claiming the Company is in violation of Article 14 of the JC #3 Feeder, Package, Mechanics & Combination Employees

Rider and all other applicable articles (beginning 7/1/13 and ongoing).

**NEW CASES:**

- N-14-92: Local 63 v. UPS, Rialto, CA  
On behalf of **Scott Barnes and all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the Company is forcing the San Bernardino hub drivers to drive vehicles that are not safe (5/16/2013).
- N-14-93: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the Company is placing employees' safety and health in jeopardy (multiple violations up to final discussion on 1/17/2014).
- N-14-94: Local 988 v. UPS, Houston, TX  
On behalf of **Pat Powell**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18, Section 14**. The Union claims the Company removed fans from four package cars in the Angleton center after being installed by UPS. Other centers have fans in some package cars (ongoing).
- N-14-95: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18, Section 6**. The Union claims the Company is in violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement Grievance #81166 (ongoing).
- N-14-96: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the Company implemented a mandatory stretching program for employees without notifying the Local Union or Safety Committee (1/15/2014).
- N-14-97: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY  
On behalf of **Todd Brinley**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 16**. The Union claims the grievant was denied a leave of absence for rehabilitation purposes and discharged. (12/13/2013).

- N-14-98: Local 63 v. UPS, Rialto, CA  
On behalf of **Myra Martinez**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 16 Section 4**. The Union claims the Company denied reasonable accommodation request (1/18/2013).
- N-14-99: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Joe Belcaro**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 14**. The Union claims the Employee was injured at work and Company did not pay subsequent medical bills incurred from injury (ongoing).
- N-14-100: Local 61 v. UPS, Asheville, NC  
On behalf of **Shannon Partain**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 14**. The Union claims Brother Partain should have his seniority date dove-tailed on the seniority list where his Company seniority date would place him (11/12/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-101: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Kenrick Jordan**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the grievant should be make whole for ticket received for using his horn while backing up, which is one of UPS safety guidelines (Grievance #81169).
- N-14-102: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Matt Larkin**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 35**. The Union claims a positive test is a dischargeable offense unless the Union and Employer expressly agree to a lesser penalty (Grievance #79862).

**PREMIUM SERVICES COMMITTEE**

**CASES CARRIED OVER:**

- N-09-258: Local 992 v. UPS, Hagerstown, MD  
On behalf of **Brett Golden**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 43 and 32**. On or about 9/29/08, UPS began using the "New Covenant" trucking company to perform bargaining unit Feeder Work that had been performed by the UPS Feeder Drivers dispatched out of the Hagerstown, MD UPS building. Specifically, UPS is allowing the non-union New Covenant trucking Company to move loads from the Home Depot Distribution Center located in Hagerstown, MD to Chicago, IL and Salt Lake City, UT.
- N-11-153: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA  
On behalf of **Larry Berru**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 43 and all others that apply**, when it moved hourly work, which was being satisfied by hourly drivers, to facilitate a mileage run.
- N-12-10: Local 891 v. UPS, Jackson, MS  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 17 and 43**, and requests Jackson mileage Feeder Drivers be paid all additional monetary conditions payment established from Memphis Feeder Operation and surrounding areas.
- N-13-163: Local 767 v. UPS, Ft. Worth, TX  
On behalf of **Steve Griffin**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Articles 17 and 43**, claiming a Sleeper Team was forced to do extra work (extra leg) which extended their week and they were not compensated at the proper rate **05339UP12**.
- N-13-493: Local 355 v. UPS, Baltimore, MD  
On behalf of **Charles Wilder**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 43**, over a pay dispute. The sleeper team was re-routed and pulled regular ground work and grievant was not paid correctly (12/16/12).

N-13-494:

Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN

On behalf of **Paul Walker**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 26, 30, 38 and all others that apply.**

The Company is utilizing a feeder driver from Atlanta, GA to pull an empty trailer into Local 480's jurisdiction and is picking up work from our daily pick-up (Amazon) and returning to GA with it (Grievance #17345).



**NEW CASES:**

N-14-103: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA

On behalf of **Ernie Frescas**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 43**. The grievant was not paid appropriate pay rate for local work performed before and after a sleeper run (8/24/2013).

N-14-104: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA

On behalf of **John Wright**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 43**. The Company changed the destination of a bid sleeper run during peak season 2013, without properly notifying the dispatch driver prior to the bid (10/7/2013).

## 9.5

### CASES CARRIED OVER:

- N-09-263: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees within NorCal**, Union alleges a violation of Article 37, claiming that the Company failed to post the Opt-In/Opt-Out list as required by the contract.
- N-11-405: Local 657 v. UPS, San Antonio, TX  
On behalf of **Joe Armstrong**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming excessive hours and requests triple-time rate of pay (Week Ending 3/26/11).
- N-11-407: Local 657 v. UPS, San Antonio, TX  
On behalf of **Leonard Gaitan**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming excessive hours on a regular basis (Week Ending 6/11/11).
- N-11-408: Local 657 v. UPS, San Antonio, TX  
On behalf of **Albert Rodriguez**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming excessive hours and requests triple-time rate of pay (Week Ending 6/4/11).
- N-12-736: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX  
On behalf of **Coby Cowling**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, when grievant, already on 9.5 list, was worked over 9.5 four days of workweek (Tues-Fri). Three days (T, W, T) over 9.5 was on same route, fourth day (F) was on different route 09219UP11.
- N-12-919: Local 886 v. UPS, Oklahoma City, OK  
On behalf of **Philip Garver**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**. The Company pulls grievant off his bid route and forces him into the unassigned pool, causing him to go over 9.5 hours (6/14, 6/16, 6/17, of 2011).

- N-12-920: Local 886 v. UPS, Oklahoma City, OK  
On behalf of **Philip Garver**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**. Company pulled grievant off his bid route and forced him to the unassigned pool, causing him to run over 9.5 hours (2/27, 2/28, 2/29 3/01, 3/02, of 2012).
- N-12-921: Local 340 v. UPS, South Portland, ME  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37 Section 1(b)**. Company cannot take the Article 37 overtime relief rights away from any bargaining unit employees (1/1/10 and ongoing).
- N-12-1130: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Corey Gosten**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is working grievant over 9.5 hours more than three (3) days in a work week (2/16/12).
- N-12-1131: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Kyle Harrison**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is working grievant over 9.5 hours more than three (3) days in a work week (March 14, 2012).
- N-12-1134: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daniel Marangiello**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (W/E 7/21/12).
- N-12-1209: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Paska**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/21/12).

- N-12-1210: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Norman Larmond**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/9/12).
- N-12-1211: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Sharone Killins**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 8/6/12).
- N-12-1212: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Paul Pantina**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/16/12).
- N-12-1213: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Victor Moreno**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/14/12).
- N-12-1214: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Andrey Lazarev**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours

worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/9/12).

- N-12-1215: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jerome Moye**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/3/12).
- N-12-1216: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Luis Monzon**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/29/12).
- N-12-1217: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Armin Kaeser**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/21/12).
- N-12-1218: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Cesar Garcia**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/21/12).
- N-12-1219: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ruben Berrios**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Santiago Lado has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard

that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 8/8/12).

- N-12-1220: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael Aspinall**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Supervisor Lawrence Maher has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 1/19/12, but escalated 6/27/12 and is continuous).
- N-12-1221: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Alvarado**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/9/12).
- N-12-1222: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Alvarado**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route(8/31/12).
- N-12-1223: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Beutura**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/14/12 and is continuous).

- N-12-1224: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Frank Beutura**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (7/11/12).
- N-12-1225: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vic Aghabekian**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (7/13/12).
- N-12-1226: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Julio C. Adames**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/20/12).
- N-12-1227: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Grant**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/14/12).
- N-12-1228: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steven Hernandez**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also

continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/16/12).

- N-12-1229: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alfredo Villeta**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/2/12).
- N-12-1230: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Antonio Estevez**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/29/12).
- N-12-1231: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alejandro Felix**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/14/12 and continuous).
- N-12-1232: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Domenick DeDomenico**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (9/7/12).



- N-12-1233: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alejandro Felix**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (7/9/12).
- N-12-1234: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Black**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (9/6/12).
- N-12-1235: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Calero**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/16/12 but escalated 7/17/12).
- N-12-1236: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daniel Casilla**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/16/12 until current).
- N-12-1237: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Zhao Chen**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance

of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/25/12).

- N-12-1238: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shawn Williams**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/7/12 until current).
- N-12-1239: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **David Torres**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/14/12).
- N-12-1240: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mario Sanclemente**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually fails to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 8/6/12).
- N-12-1241: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ashram Seepersaud**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually fails to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/7/12 until current).

- N-12-1242: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jerri Sengstacken**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/7/12).
- N-12-1243: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Contini**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 6/4/12 until current).
- N-12-1244: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Milton Torres**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/7/12 until current).
- N-12-1245: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ashram Seepersaud**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 7/19/12).
- N-12-1246: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Javier Pellot**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in

the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 8/8/12).

- N-12-1247: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vinny Perrone**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/23/12).
- N-12-1248: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Javier Pellot**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (9/6/12).
- N-12-1249: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Pawlikowski**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/7/12).
- N-12-1250: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vinny Perrone**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/16/12).

- N-12-1251: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Javier Pelot**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/18/12).
- N-12-1252: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Morley Purvis**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 7/13/12).
- N-12-1253: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Antonio Rosciglione**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 6/18/12).
- N-12-1254: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Caryl Robalino**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/2/12).
- N-12-1255: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shevier Ramsamuj**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight

(8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (8/14/12).

N-12-1256: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Antonio Rosciglione**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/26/12).

N-12-1258: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Kotarowski**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/2/12 until current).

N-12-1259: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Susan Martin**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/19/12 until current).

N-12-1260: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Thomas Oliver**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/29/12).

- N-12-1261: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Susan Martin**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer approved the relief of overtime but failed to adjust the dispatch so as to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route (5/24/12).
- N-12-1262: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Padro**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Employer continually failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce the package car driver's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also continually failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 6/18/12).
- N-12-1263: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Cesar Garcia**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)** and the 9.5 Committee Guidelines. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (W/E 7/21/12 and ongoing).
- N-12-1269: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming supervisors are working (RC 4-12-031), 10/6/11 ongoing.
- N-13-193: Local 728 v. UPS, Atlanta, GA  
On behalf of **Kendall Greeson**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. Grievant is on the 9.5 list for the Acworth, GA center, filed a grievance for W/E 5/28/11; meets Article 37 requirements, and should be paid penalty pay (originally filed as Case N-12-754).

- N-13-194: Local 728 v. UPS, Atlanta, GA  
On behalf of **Ryan Gentry**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. Grievant is on the 9.5 list for the Acworth, GA center, filed a grievance for W/E 5/28/11; meets Article 37 requirements, and should be paid penalty pay (originally docketed as Case N-12-1205).
- N-13-499: Local 509 v. UPS, Charleston, SC  
On behalf of **David Amaker**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The grievant claims they were a victim of harassment (12/21/11).
- N-13-500: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Spencer**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 5/11/13).
- N-13-501: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Mark Spencer**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 5/18/13).
- N-13-502: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Tim Marsh**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days, the week of 5/13/13 to 5/17/13.
- N-13-503: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **John Gollogly**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days, the week of 5/13/13 to 5/17/13.
- N-13-504: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Dave Stalder**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours the weeks of 5/9/11, 5/23/11, 5/31/11, 6/6/11, 7/12/11 and 7/19/11.



- N-13-506: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Barbette Blood**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 8/30).
- N-13-507: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Russ Sloane**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 8/16).
- N-13-508: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **John Quain**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 8/10).
- N-13-509: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **John Quain**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 8/17).
- N-13-510: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **John Vojtisek**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three (3) or more days (Week Ending 8/30).
- N-13-511: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamtom, NY  
On behalf of **Ryan Savage**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three or more days (Week Ending 6/29).
- N-13-512: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamtom, NY  
On behalf of **Ryan Savage**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three or more days (Week Ending 5/17).
- N-13-513: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamtom, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Guy**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three or more days (Week Ending 8/23).

- N-13-514: Local 693 v. UPS, Binghamton, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Guy**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming grievant worked over 9.5 hours three or more days (Week Ending 8/30).
- N-13-516: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ray Sanfilippo**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 7/14/12, 7/21/12, 7/28/12, 8/10/12, 8/17/12, 8/24/12, 8/31/12 and 5/25/13).
- N-13-517: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Nigel Lyken Sampson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 7/21/12, 8/11/12, and 9/15/12).
- N-13-518: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gary Gilchrist**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Week Ending 6/29/13).
- N-13-519: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Antonio Freitas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Week Ending 6/1/13).
- N-13-520: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alberto Arias**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 6/22/13 and 7/27/13).
- N-13-521: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mikhail Neyshtat**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 6/22/13 and 8/10/13).
- N-13-522: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Raul A. Lopez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 5/25/13 and 6/1/13).
- N-13-523: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alejandro Felix**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company approved the relief of overtime but failed to

adjust the dispatch to provide an amount of work that can reasonably be completed within eight (8) hours; which then caused the driver to work in excess of eight and one-half (8.5) hours to complete the route 8/23/13).

- N-13-524: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Alejandro Felix**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/13/13 up to and including 8/23/13).
- N-13-525: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Angel Alvarado**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 4/1/13 up to and including 9/6/13).
- N-13-526: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Armin Kaeser**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/11/13 up to and including 9/6/13).
- N-13-527: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ashram Seepersad**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/25/13 up to and including 9/6/13).

- N-13-528: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Daniel Casilla**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/28/13 up to and including 5/31/13).
- N-13-529: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **David Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 4/15/13 up to and including 9/6/13).
- N-13-530: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dominick Camastro**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 8/12/13 up to and including 9/6/13).
- N-13-531: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Emmanuel Aracena**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 8/12/13 up to and including 9/6/13).
- N-13-532: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ernesto Arman**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually

failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/8/13 up to and including 8/30/13).

- N-13-533: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jeri Sengstacken**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/13/13 up to and including 5/17/13).
- N-13-534: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joe Prunty**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 6/24/13 up to and including 6/28/13).
- N-13-535: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joseph Martello**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/11/13 up to and including 4/19/13).
- N-13-536: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Pablo Lopez**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 7/8/13 up to and including 9/6/13).

- N-13-537: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Padro**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 4/1/13 up to and including 8/23/13).
- N-13-538: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Lance Howard**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Week Ending 6/1/13).
- N-13-539: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Richard Pawlikowski**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/4/13 up to and including 8/30/13).
- N-13-540: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Rob Kotarowski**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 6/10/13 up to and including 8/16/13).
- N-13-541: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Thomas Oliver**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 9/17/12 up to and including 9/6/13).

- N-13-542: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gustavo Escobar**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 2/25/13 up to and including 3/8/13).
- N-13-543: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jerome Moye**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 2/11/13 up to and including 2/15/13).
- N-13-544: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Contini**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 2/25/13 up to and including 3/1/13).
- N-13-545: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Luis Monzon**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 2/18/13 up to and including 7/19/13).
- N-13-546: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Milton Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually

failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 2/4/13 up to and including 7/19/13).

- N-13-547: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shammie Ramslimar**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/18/13 up to and including 3/22/13).
- N-13-548: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Shawn Williams**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 5/13/13 up to and including 8/9/13).
- N-13-549: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Thomas McCarthy**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/4/13 up to and including 3/15/13).
- N-13-550: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Osman**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/22/13 and ongoing).



- N-13-551: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Passadino**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/29/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-552: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Anthony Reynolds**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/29/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-553: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Robinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/25/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-554: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jose Suarez**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 8/17/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-555: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joe Waters**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to

grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/21/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-556: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dan Marangiello**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/29/13).
- N-13-557: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **William Postupak**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/29/13).
- N-13-558: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Arthur Cowcer**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 7/13/13).
- N-13-559: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Scott Kersch**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to cooperate with grievant who desired to be relieved of overtime (6/24/13).
- N-13-560: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Gary Bolk**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to cooperate with grievant who desired to be relieved of overtime (7/12/13).

- N-13-561: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Ambrosio**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to cooperate with grievant who desired to be relieved of overtime (6/14/13).
- N-13-562: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Grego**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to cooperate with grievant who desired to be relieved of overtime (6/21/13).
- N-13-563: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Cain**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to cooperate with grievant who desired to be relieved of overtime (6/28/13).
- N-13-564: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Robinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to cooperate with grievant who desired to be relieved of overtime (7/1/13).
- N-13-565: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Steve Ambrosio**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/11/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-566: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Antici**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/4/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-567: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dan Betancourt**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/8/13).
- N-13-568: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Bond**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/1/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-569: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ralph Carucci**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/8/13).
- N-13-570: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Ramon Silvestre**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 3/24/12, 3/31/12, 4/7/12, 4/14/12, 4/21/12, 4/28/12, 5/5/12, 5/26/12, 6/2/12, 6/23/12 and 6/30/12).
- N-13-571: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Melvin Iguina**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming over 9.5 (Weeks Ending 7/7/12 and 7/14/12).
- N-13-572: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Chris Coleman**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after

letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/25/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-573: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Del Gaudio**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/18/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-574: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Dulaney**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/18/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-575: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Emilio**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 7/6/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-576: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Bill Keller**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 4/20/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-577: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dennis Kotarski**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 6/1/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-578: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mike Neary**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (Week Ending 5/25/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-579: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Victor Moreno**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/4/13 up to and including 3/8/13)
- N-13-580: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Vivian Ormsby**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 3/4/13 up to and including 3/8/13)

**NEW CASES:**

- N-14-105: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kevin Devereux**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1b**. The Union claims the Employer failed to cooperate with package car driver Kevin Devereux who desired to be relieved of overtime (7/26/2013).
- N-14-106: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jon Koepfel**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1b**. The Union claims the Employer failed to cooperate with package car driver Jon Koepfel who desired to be relieved of overtime (7/26/2013).
- N-14-107: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Young**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1b**. The Union claims the Employer failed to cooperate with package car driver John Young who desired to be relieved of overtime (9/30/2013).
- N-14-108: Local 287 v. UPS, San Jose, CA  
On behalf of **Patty Oberst**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Company pulled the grievant off her bid route to work over 9.5 hours per day (July 2013).
- N-14-109: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Michael DelGaudio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Michael DelGaudio workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 8/31/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-110: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Robert Dulaney**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Robert Dulaney workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also

failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 9/14/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-111: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Dennis Kotarski**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Dennis Kotarski workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 9/21/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-112: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Arthur Cowcer**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Arthur Cowcer workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/25/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-113: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Kevin Devereux**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Kevin Devereux workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/27/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-114: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Mark English**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Mark English workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 8/3/2013 and ongoing).



- N-14-115: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Scott Kersch**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Scott Kersch workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/13/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-116: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **John Hoffman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver John Hoffman workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/27/2013).
- N-14-117: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Jon Koepfel**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Jon Koepfel workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013).
- N-14-118: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Larry Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Larry Marino workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 8/31/2013).
- N-14-119: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Paul Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Paul Marino workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed

to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-120: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Tomas Viera**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Tomas Viera workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013).
- N-14-121: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Joe Waters**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Joe Waters workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013).
- N-14-122: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY  
On behalf of **Eric Borrero**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming the grievant is a cover driver who worked over 9.5 hours on the 97a route consistently and asked to be put on opt-in list week ending 9/7/13. Manager Dan Laturrza refused to add his name to the 9.5 list. Eric worked over 9.5 every day after that for the next 2 weeks. He should be paid triple time for all hours over 9.5 (week ending 9/7/2013, 9/14/2013 and 9/21/2013).
- N-14-123: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Art Harder**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is violating the grievant's 9.5 rights (ongoing in 2013).
- N-14-124: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Javier Torres**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is violating the grievant's 9.5 rights (ongoing in 2013).

- N-14-125: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ  
On behalf of **Kevin Hines**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is violating the grievant's 9.5 rights (ongoing in 2013).
- N-14-126: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (3/30/2013).
- N-14-127: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (4/6/2013).
- N-14-128: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (6/29/2013).
- N-14-129: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (7/6/2013).
- N-14-130: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL  
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (7/13/2013).

CSI

- N-14-131: Local 295 v. UPS, Valley Stream, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 7**, claiming a violation of seniority (7/29/2013, 9/11, 9/12, 9/28, 9/29, 9/30 and 10/4/2013).
- N-14-132: Local 295 v. UPS, Valley Stream, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 2b**, claiming there is no mandatory lunch break in the contract (7/29, 8/4, 9/27, 10/12, 10/18 and 10/25/2013).
- N-14-133: Local 295 v. UPS, Valley Stream, NY  
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 2**, claiming the Company chose to close their facility which caused the men to lose 2 days of pay (10/29-30/2012).
- N-14-134: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR  
On behalf of **Jose Colon and Juan Rivera**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 10**, claiming the Company subcontracted work to Mayaguez and did not use the employees to make delivery (7/3/2013).